The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit

and its Impact on World History

Volume III

by

E. Michael Jones

South Bend, Indiana

2020

Published by Fidelity Press in South Bend, Indiana
www.fidelitypress.org
(574) 289–9786
Copyright © 2020 by E. Michael Jones
Second Edition, First Printing 2020

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of Fidelity Press.

Printed and bound in the United States of America by Sheridan Press

1 2 3 4 5 6 10 09 08 07 06 05 04

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Jones, E. Michael

The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and its Impact on World History

in three volumes; Volume III of III, 540 pages, 6 x 9 inches
Includes bibliographical references and index

ISBN 978-0-929891-28-6

1. Revolution—World History. 2. Jews—World History.

3. Catholic Church—World History.

Cover art by Timothy Michael Jones
Vol. I: Barabbas, Vol. II: Shabbetai Zevi, Vol. III: Leon Trotsky

Table of Contents

Chapter 1	Lejzor and Fiszel Sing the Blues: Chess Records and the Black Jewish Alliance	13
Chapter 2	L'Affaire Williamson: The Catholic Church and Holocaust Denial	31
Chapter 3	The End of Catholic-Jewish Dialogue	141
Chapter 4	Close Encounters: Paul Gottfried's Friends	165
Chapter 5	Faking Woodstock	187
Chapter 6	Rabbinical Despotism	207
Chapter 7	The End of Dialogue and the Beginning of Unity	225
Chapter 8	Jewish Nazis	243
Chapter 9	The Bishops and the Logic of Events	293
Chapter 10	Wall Street Rises	305
Chapter 11	A Coney Island of the Mindless	313
Chapter 12	Airhead Generation	333
Chapter 13	Woody Allen and the Double Standard	347
Chapter 14	Null Bock	355
Chapter 15	Why We Lost the Culture Wars	365
Chapter 16	Catholic-Jewish Dialogue: The Gift that Keeps on Gifting	373
Chapter 17	Who Shtupped the *Shiksa*? Harvey Weinstein Creates Moral Panic in Hollywood	395
Chapter 18	Catholics and the Jew Taboo	415
Chapter 19	Donald Trump and the "Russian" Mafia	429
Chapter 20	Jewish Privilege	441
Chapter 21	Nazi Hunters and Their Catholic Proxy Warriors	461
Endnotes		487
Index		509

Chapter One

Lejzor and Fiszel Sing the Blues

Chess Records and the Black-Jewish Alliance

As some indication that the Black-Jewish alliance was a hot topic in the wake of Barack Obama's election in 2008 as president of the United States, Sony released the movie *Cadillac Records*, its homage to one of the most fertile periods of collaboration between Blacks and Jews, the '50s and '60s. *Cadillac Records* celebrates one of the most significant areas of their cultural collaboration as well, namely, "race music," later renamed rock 'n roll.

Obama mentioned the influence which the Black-Jewish alliance had had on his life in a speech he gave at the AIPAC convention during the summer of the 2008 election campaign. Obama was, in more ways than he would like to enumerate in public, a product of that alliance, but in hinting at that fact he was also less than honest about the particular terms of engagement it stipulated and the causes of its eventual demise. In this regard, Barack Obama has a lot in common with *Cadillac Records*, the biopic celebrating the lives of an unlikely ménage of Polish Jews and Mississippi sharecroppers and the music they produced. It is difficult to imagine something less capable of arousing fraternal feelings among Blacks or Jews than the saga of Chess records in Chicago and the tales of cheating, drug abuse, and sexual degeneracy that went along with it, but the *Zeitgeist*, both then and now, has a logic all its own, and it is one which Hollywood has shown itself determined to follow.

During the 1930s, on one of his Library of Congress-sponsored ethnic music collecting expeditions through the South, Alan Lomax popped open the trunk of his car and recorded the singing of a Mississippi Delta cotton picker by the name of McKinley Morganfield. The moment gets captured in *Cadillac Records*, which documents, in its revisionist and sanitized way, one of the most significant chapters in the Black-Jewish alliance. By 1943 McKinley Morganfield had had enough of chopping cotton and decided to join what would become the greatest internal migration in American history when he got on an Illinois Central train and moved to Chicago, where he changed his occupation to blues singer and his name to Muddy Waters.

The change in locale necessitated a change in the music. Robert Johnson-style blues played on an acoustic guitar was no match for the noise of a city

like Chicago, so Muddy Waters got himself an electric guitar. *Cadillac Records* has him busking on the streets of Chicago with his electric guitar but offers no explanation of who was providing the electricity.

In an April 1948 session, Muddy Waters recorded two electrified songs: "I can't be satisfied" and "I feel like going home." Both were anthems of Black migration, and both records addressed the mind of the Black migrants, who were torn between nostalgia for the simpler life they had left behind in Mississippi and the largely sexual attractions of emancipation from both segregation and the moral law which big northern cities like Chicago provided.

If demography is destiny, Muddy Waters was destined to become a star because by 1948 Chicago was home to 500,000 refugees from the Mississippi delta who had a set of musical tastes and longings that had been created in the cotton fields and weren't going to be satisfied, now that they were in Chicago, by the crooning of people like Bing Crosby.

Muddy Waters didn't write his own material. The uncrowned poet laureate of the Black migration to Chicago was a fellow Mississippian by the name of Willie Dixon, who articulated the longings of the former sharecroppers by telling them that he was their "Hoochie Coochie Man." Since moving to Chicago seemed like dying and going to heaven, at least on Saturday night, Dixon explained their good fortune by claiming there was a special juju attached to the train ride up from Mississippi. With Muddy Waters as his front man, Dixon was telling them that "on the seventh hour, on the seventh day, on the seventh month, the seven doctors say" that all of the Hoochie Coochie men in Chicago had been "born for good luck . . ." If for no one else, the song proved to be good juju for Muddy Waters. "He was doing that song until the day he died," Dixon said later. "I'm Your Hoochie Coochie Man" was a song that Muddy Waters could sing with conviction, and when he did, the Negroes on the South Side of Chicago believed every word he said and bought his records. Muddy Waters was what the next generation would call a role model for the Negro migrant, and they listened to what he said and acted accordingly. The results were disastrous for the Black family, something noted almost as an aside in *Cadillac Records*, and less than salubrious for everyone else, something which does not get noted at all. Muddy Waters dealt with the *sequelae* of his liberated passions in a way that suited his new abode and the lifestyle which went with it: he hired a Jewish lawyer to defend him against the many paternity suits filed against him. He never lost a case, but failed to realize that those legal fees were coming off the top of his royalties. Muddy Waters got his Mojo working in Chicago, but he never learned how to read; in terms of writing, he mastered two words "McKinley" and "Morganfield," which he signed to a number of recording contracts, whose details remained opaque to him until the 1970s when other lawyers explained to him how he had been cheated out of his royalties.

The men who cheated this and other largely illiterate bluesmen from Mississippi were two Polish Jews, Leonard and Phil Chess. Lejzor Czyz (born in 1917) and his younger brother Fiszel (born 1921) arrived in Chicago in 1928 along with their sister Malka and their parents Yasef and Cyrla. The Czyz family had emigrated from Motele, the Polish *shtetl* which had produced Chaim Weitzman, Israel's first president. After arriving at Ellis Island, the Czyz family made its way to Chicago, where Yasef tried to find work as a shoemaker and where his son, who Anglicized his name to Leonard Chess, struggled to learn English and make a living as a "restless and unhappy"[1] junk dealer.

In 1946 Leonard Chess bought a small restaurant located at 3905 South Cottage Grove, in what was then the heart of Bronzeville, the Negro Tenderloin District, and renamed it the Macomba Lounge. Nadine Cohodas tells us that Cottage Grove Street "had become a magnet for Black Chicagoans looking for spirited night-life. Music, prostitution, drugs-all were easily available. . . . It was a world of pimps, hookers, maids, chauffeurs, good-time whites, factory workers, white collar workers, musicians, entertainers, bartenders, waiters."

Moral corruption, in other words, was part of the migration experience. Nadine Cohodas claims that "Prostitution was so common that Phil candidly described the neighborhood as home to 'pimps and whores.'"[2] She then tries to finesse the question of the Chess brothers' involvement in this vice. "Prostitution was a financial boon to the club," and "There was nothin' but dope in the place," according to one of the musicians who played there, but "Nobody thought that Leonard was involved in drug dealing," even though "it would be bad for business to crack down, not to mention futile."[3]

Were Jews like Leonard Chess responsible for the moral corruption of the Negro migrants to Chicago? The question seems odd because the Blues and sexual immorality have by now become synonymous. At a time when between 70 and 80 percent of all Black babies are born out of wedlock, sexual immorality has come to be seen as a constituent element of what it means to be Black, and so no asks how this situation came about. Racism surely plays a role in all of these assumptions, but since sexual deviance has become the norm in America, no one gets upset by such claims anymore, not as upset anyway, as by claims that Blacks are genetically inferior to whites when it comes to intelligence. The solution to the problem of sexual deviance has been to redefine it out of existence. Race music is one of the cultural devices which have made that redefinition plausible to large numbers of people. The cliché of the oversexed bluesman, however, obscures the moral corruption that often overwhelmed the families of Black migrants up from the South when they arrived in Chicago. The fact that so many whites followed their example, largely because of the widespread effect that the dissemination of "race music" exerted during this period, doesn't change the moral law written

on the hearts of all men, Black and white, and that something has to happen to obscure that fact.

That something is usually passion, but in this instance it was the deliberate excitation of passion through a certain kind of music for both financial and political reasons. During the 50-year period following World War II, mass audiences at first came to tolerate sexual deviance as part of the lifestyle of Black musicians and then they came to expect it of the musicians, both Black and white, who played that kind of music.

In *Cadillac Records*, Leonard Chess is portrayed as profane but morally upright and faithful to his wife when faced with the same temptations to which Muddy Waters succumbed. Nadine Cohodas, in spite of her attempt to make the Chess brothers respectable, tells a slightly different story when she informs us that Leonard's "other life . . . occasionally . . . came to light in one special circumstance or another."[4] When a Black motorcycle gang showed up unannounced at Leonard's hospital bed, Leonard's son Marshall suddenly realized that his father lived something akin to the double life that Muddy Waters sang about, even if there were no illegitimate children to show for it.

Most Americans would find it difficult to believe that a Jew could corrupt the morals of a Negro because most Americans feel that the Negro never had any sexual morals to begin with. The situation in Chicago, however, comes into clearer focus when Cohodas writes about Leonard's dealings with white boys like Bobby Charles Guidry (who later renamed himself Bobby Charles), the Louisiana teenager who wrote "See You Later, Alligator." In fact, Chess's dealings with Guidry throw a new and largely unflattering light on the morally corrupting effect Chess had on all of his protégés. "Leonard," according to Cohodas, "told Charles in their first meeting that Chess would make him rich and famous and he could have all the women he wanted, though Leonard had expressed the latter sentiment in far cruder terms than the 17-year-old was used to."[5] *Cadillac Records* doesn't dwell on the point, but it seems that Chuck Berry isn't the only one at Chess Records who should have been arrested for transporting minors across state lines for immoral purposes. Instead of being the direct beneficiary (sexually, at least), Leonard Chess was the pimp.

If feminism has done anything, it has taught women to brag about their moral degradation as the badge of liberation. The situation at Chess Records, feminism notwithstanding, throws the issue of moral corruption into even starker relief than the story of Bobby Charles. Linda Ellerbee, who worked for Chess as one of the nation's first female disc jockeys, concedes that she was financially exploited by Chess, but her feminism obscures the deeper type of exploitation that was going on when Chess procured abortions for female employees. After appealing to Leonard Chess, Linda Ellerbee received $600 to pay for an abortion. Ellerbee left Chess's office "feeling ashamed and in tears, but she reminded herself that he had provided the money without hesitation and he didn't fire her."[6]

Leonard Chess knew that the music he was promoting was corrupting the morals of the Blacks whose interests he claimed to be serving. Chess, according to Cohodas,

> said he was sure that all blacks listened to R & B "although not all will admit it. He likes jazz with the windows open but blues when the windows are closed. "I'm a Jew, but I don't like some of the music my father listened to," he went on. "It's the same with the Negro. . . . We want a Top 40 format with Negro music, not the Uncle Tom . . . Stepin Fetchit."[7]

Negro music, in other words, was synonymous with sexual degeneracy, and the Jewish record producer who cheated his talent out of their royalties and the Jewish disc jockey who got paid off by the Jewish record producer could, like the Jewish pimp, salve his conscience by claiming that he was only supplying the public with what it wanted.

In spite of Henry Ford's warnings during the 1920s, Americans were still largely clueless in understanding Jewish cultural subversion and the moral subversion that was its necessary companion. The Poles, on the other hand, had had centuries of experience in dealing with this sort of thing.

As discussed in more length in volume two, in 1936, Augustine Cardinal Hlond, the Primate of Poland, issued a pastoral letter on morals in which he claimed that Polish Jews were responsible for the moral corruption of the Polish nation. Hlond specifically mentioned Jewish involvement in pornography and prostitution as a danger to the morals of the Christian majority of Poland.[8-9] He also mentioned Polish youth as particularly vulnerable.

> One should stay away from the harmful moral influence of Jews, keep away from their anti-Christian culture, and especially boycott the Jewish press and demoralizing Jewish publications. But it is forbidden to assault, beat up, maim, or slander Jews. One should honor and love Jews as human beings and neighbors, even though we do not honor the indescribable tragedy of that nation, which was the guardian of the idea of the Messiah and from which was born the Savior.[10]

Cardinal Hlond's warning hearkened back to the 6th and 7th century theological concerns of Pope Gregory the Great, the first pope to articulate "*Sicut Judaeis non*," the traditional teaching of the Church on the Jews. It also gives much needed cross-cultural perspective on what was essentially a Polish problem transported to America, namely, Jewish involvement in prostitution and pornography.

Ever since the release of iconic Blaxploitation films like *Superfly* and *The Mack* in the 1970s, the pimp has been a Black figure in the public mind in America, one associated with the outlandish clothing and cars (in particular, the Cadillac El Dorado), as parodied in satiric films like *Undercover Brother.* This cultural phenomenon obscures the fact that during the 1920s and 1930s

in both Poland and America, prostitution was a Jewish business. Jews not Blacks were responsible for "White Slavery."

"Between 1880 and 1939," Edward Bristow writes, "the Jews played a conspicuous role in 'white slavery,' as the commercial prostitution of that era was dramatically called. Not only was this Jewish participation conspicuous, it was historically unprecedented, geographically widespread, and fraught with collective political dangers." "Jewish trafficking," Bristow continues, "was anchored in brothel keeping," women "freelanced or kept houses while their husbands procured . . . Jewish traffickers also supplied Gentile-run houses."[11] The Jews learned their trade in Eastern and Central Europe, where they, again according to Bristow, "dominated the international traffic out of the area."[12]

Jewish involvement in prostitution continues to the present day, in spite of media efforts to obscure it. The high-class prostitution operation which ensnared Elliott Spitzer when he was governor of New York was run by a Jewish pimp, similar to the ones which Bristow described. With the fall of communism and the collapse of the economies of the former Soviet bloc countries, many eastern European women ended up in brothels in Israel run by the descendants of the pimps who ran the white slavery trade in the Pale of the Settlement during the first half of the 20th century.

On January 11, 1998, the *New York Times* ran an article on Slavic Gentile prostitutes trapped in Israel. With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the resulting economic chaos, hundreds of thousands of Russian and Ukrainian women were dispersed throughout the world, most entrapped in an international prostitution trade run by the "Russian mafia," a significant part of which is Jewish. According to an article by Leonard Fine in a 1998 Jewish Bulletin, "Israel has become a routine destination for the global trafficking of women," and "The turnover of the prostitution trade in Israel comes to some $450 million a year."[13]

The sex trade in Israel began in the Pale of the Settlement. By 1889 Jewish women ran 203 of 289 (70 percent) of the licensed brothels in the "Pale of Settlement" (encompassing over 20 provinces in eastern Poland and western Russia—an area where Jews were about 12 percent of the population). Of the 5127 licensed prostitutes in this area 1122 or (22 percent) were Jewish. Bristow claims that, "The grievous political dangers for local Jewry in the context of enduring interethnic hostilities, when 78 percent of the rest of the women were Gentile, many indentured in Jewish houses, is obvious."[14] In Minsk, Jews ran all four legitimate houses of ill repute. In the Russian province of Kherson (which includes the city of Odessa) 30 of 36 licensed brothels were Jewish-owned. The American Consul in Odessa wrote in 1908 that the "whole 'business' of prostitution is almost exclusively in the hands of the Jews."[15]

In Vienna, authorities knew of about 50 Jewish prostitution traffickers based in Czernowitz, "and they were a very inbred lot extending over two

> generations." The most publicized 'white slavery' trial occurred in 1892, in Lemberg (once also called Lvov, then a Polish provincial capital, today called Lviv in Ukraine), where 27 traffickers—all Jews—were prosecuted for ensnaring women to go to Constantinople, Egypt, and India. Some of the women recruits understood their tasks, but others "were maids, others fieldworkers, one a butcher's helper, all apparently promised honest jobs." (Lemberg, "a cradle of Zionism from the 1880s onward," also had anti-Jewish riots in 1918.)[16]

By the 1930s, Jewish-run prostitution had spread from the Pale of the Settlement to England. According to Martin Fido,

> Jewish dominance of the East End [of London] and its crime was reflected in their Yiddish name, "spielers" (places for games). In the Brick Lane neighborhood, Isaac Bogard, a Jewish villain whose swarthy complexion and tightly curled black hair earned him the nickname "Darky the Coon," extended his interests. He began in the early years of the 20th century by supplying muscle for street traders who wanted to prevent newcomers from moving in, but he moved on to managing prostitutes and drinking clubs."[17]

Jewish involvement in white slavery (especially when it involved Jewish pimps prostituting gentile women) led to a rise in anti-Semitism in the turbulent period following World War I. Adolf Hitler was infuriated that many non-Jewish women were lured into what was largely a Jewish-run operation in Vienna. Hitler wrote in *Mein Kampf*:

> In no other city of Western Europe could the relationship between Jewry and prostitution, and even now the white slave traffic, be studied better than in Vienna . . . an icy shudder ran down my spine when seeing for the first time the Jew as an evil, shameless, and calculating manager of this shocking vice, the outcome of the scum of the big city.[18]

During the last half of the 19th century, Jewish pimps from the Pale of the Settlement expanded their prostitution network to include the New World.

> Thirty-nine Jews were expelled from Brazil in 1879 for soliciting women for prostitution and running illegal whorehouses. [BRISTOW, p. 114] Of 199 licensed whorehouses in Buenos Aires in 1909, 102 were run by Jews and more than half the prostitutes were Jewish. [FRIED, p. 71] 4,248 Jewish women were registered for licensed brothels in Buenos Aires between 1880-1913, and those represented only the licensed ones. Edward Bristow estimates that 9,000 Jewish women immigrants came to Brazil in a 25-year span in that era as prostitutes (many were no doubt highly transient), when the total Jewish population of Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay combined amounted to less than 60,000 people in 1910. [BRISTOW, p. 119] In 1889, the Buenos Aires Bulletin Continental

> reported that 200 German/Austrian women were held against their will by Jewish pimps from Poland. [GUY, p. 5] "Jewish procurers," says Donna Guy, ". . . became an organized ring in major cities all over the world. They were particularly powerful in the Argentine port cities of Buenos Aires and Rosario . . . [GUY, p. 10] . . . Turn-of-the-century reports by the Hamburg B'nai Kith [a Jewish fraternal organization] concluded that most prostitutes in Buenos Aires were Jewish and that traffickers 'dress with ostentatious elegance, wear large diamonds, go to the theatre or opera daily; they have their own clubs and organizations where wares are sorted, auctioned, and sold. They have their own secret wireless code, are well organized, and—heavens!—in South America everything is possible.'" [GUY, p. 19][19]

After the war, "Jews," according to an account by Marvin Wolf, a Jewish captain in the U.S. Army serving in Germany, "recruited starving, desperate German girls and opened brothels." According to Rabbi Dave, the Jewish chaplain in Frankfurt am Main, the Jewish pimps "Got their revenge [on the German people], and got rich, too," something he found morally repugnant: "They're in other businesses now, but do you really want to spend Pesach [Passover] with such people?"[20]

The same thing held true for North America. Jewish immigration meant a sharp rise in prostitution in cities like New York.

> In 1909 one Jewish observer, Marcus Braun, estimated there to be 50,000 Jewish immigrant prostitutes in America and 10,000 pimps. (Edward Bristow considers these figures grossly inflated, but notes that one of Braun's colleagues, echoing at least public feelings about the problem, thought there were up to 100,000 American Jewish women of ill repute.) In any case, the Jewish pimps of New York City (who owned many of the "so-called French" bordellos in the Tenderloin district and "sought to fill them with French prostitutes from abroad") [BRISTOL, p. 165] had their own official organization: "The New York Independent Benevolent Association." Frances Kellar, a respected social worker, wrote in 1907 that "the two nationalities who may be said to be central to the disorderly house business in New York [are] French and Jewish . . . French houses . . . are not . . . to be so much feared as the Jewish . . . [which are] thoroughly vicious and bad." [BRISTOL, p. 165] By the turn of the century, "hundreds and hundreds" of Jewish women walked the Lower East Side of New York City as prostitutes. [FRIED, p. 8] Benjamin Altman described the whores he saw on Allen Street: "A hundred women on every . . . corner. Tall women, short women. Fair women. Ugly women." [FRIED, p. 12][21]

The American public was beginning to note the high Jewish representation in the prostitution trade. In the June 1909 issue of *McClure's* magazine, for instance, George Kibbe Turner wrote that "the appearance of the Jewish

dealer in women" was "a product of New York politics." The Jewish pimp "has vitiated more than any other single agency the moral life of the great cities of America in the past ten years."[22]

"It is an absolute fact," wrote Ernest Bell in his 1911 book about white slavery, "that corrupt Jews are now the backbone of the loathsome traffic in New York and Chicago. The good Jews know this and feel keenly the unspeakable shame of it."[23] "The criminal instincts that are so often found naturally in the Russian and Polish Jew," wrote Frank Moss in a popular volume called *American Metropolis* (1897), "come to the surface in such ways as to warrant the opinion that these people are the worst element in the entire make-up of New York City . . . A large proportion of the people of New Israel are addicted to vice."[24]

The situation in Chicago was just as bad as in New York. Prostitution was an essentially Jewish business in both cities.

> By 1907 Rabbi Emil Hirsch declared that 75 percent of the "white slavery" in his city was controlled by Jews. [BRISTOW, p. 177] The Jewish periodical, the *Forward*, forlornly reported that "the facts that were uncovered at the trial [for corruption] of [police] inspector McCann are horrifying. 75 percent of the white slave trade in Chicago is in Jewish hands. The owners of most of the immoral resorts on the West Side are Jews. Even in Gentile neighborhoods Jews stand out prominently in the nefarious business." [FRIED, p. 70][25]

Then as now, there was a connection between the music business and prostitution. In his autobiography, Jewish singer Eddie Fisher wrote that "while performing in England in the late 1950s I had become friendly with a Jewish song plugger, a man who eventually left the music business to open a very exclusive whorehouse."[26]

When Marshall Chess went to work for his father, he felt a sense of frustration at the unspecific nature of his new job. At first it seemed that his job was just to drive around with his father. Later Marshall learned that his job was to observe his father and then imitate his behavior. That meant bribing disk jockeys with cash and other perks. According to Cohodas, it meant being a pimp but not a drug dealer. "You might even get somebody a girl, if you have to," Marshall Chess told Nadine Cohodas, who was quick to add that Chess *fils*, "never paid anybody cash and never bought them drugs."[27]

In 1948 Muddy Waters began a short but intense set of gigs at the Macomba Lounge. *Cadillac Records* portrays them as one long brawl interrupted by a few musical interludes. Then, in 1950, the Macomba Lounge burned down. Cohodas calls the timing of the fire "fortuitous" but claims that "an insurance investigation turned up nothing untoward."[28] The Black term for the "fortuitous" combustion of Semitic property in the Black ghettos of large cities like Chicago and Philadelphia is "Jewish Lightning." Whatever its

cause, after the fire, the Chess brothers were "happy with a cash settlement that netted them as much, if not more, than they could have gotten from a sale."[29] The insurance settlement launched them into the record business.

By the time the Chess family arrived in Chicago in 1928 as poor immigrants from Poland, popular music in America was already in Jewish hands. Commenting on a Sherman anti-trust suit filed against Irving Berlin, Leo Feist and the officers of seven New York music publishing corporations, Henry Ford claimed that "Popular Music is a Jewish monopoly. Jazz is a Jewish creation. The mush, the slush, the sly suggestion, the abandoned sensuousness of sliding notes, are of Jewish origin."[30] The defendants, Ford claimed, "controlled 80 percent of the available copyrighted songs used by manufacturers of phonographs, player piano rolls and other musical reproducing instruments, and fixed prices at which the records or rolls were to be sold to the public."[31] The other 20 percent were controlled by other Jewish music houses not included in that special group.

Jewish control of popular music through what would come to be known as the music industry began with the "song pluggers," largely vaudeville entertainers at the time, who would popularize by repeated renditions on the stage, until the flabby mind of the "ten-twent'-thirt'" audiences began to repeat it on the streets. These "song pluggers" were "the paid agents of the Yiddish song agencies. Money, and not merit, . . . dominates the spread of the moron music which is styled 'Jewish Jazz.'"[32]

JEWISH JAZZ

Tin Pan Alley, the section of 28th St. in New York between Broadway and Sixth Avenue, the heart of the American music industry when Ford published his critique of the "'Abies' and 'Izzies' and 'Moes' who make up the composing staffs of the various . . . Yiddish song manufacturers" had more than a little in common with the Jewish pimps who came over with them during the great wave of Jewish immigration because

> Flocks of young girls who thought they could sing, and others, who thought they could write song poems, came to the neighborhood allured by dishonest advertisements that promised more than the budding Yiddish exploiters were able to fulfill. Needless to say, scandal became rampant, as it always does where so-called "Gentile" girls are reduced to the necessity of seeking favors from the eastern type of Jew.[33]

If Tin Pan Alley was another word for the music business in American, then that business was a version of the Black-Jewish alliance from the moment of its inception. By the mid-'20s, when the book that would eventually become known as *The International Jew* began appearing in the *Dearborn Independent*, Ford noted "the organized eagerness of the Jew to make an alliance with the Negro." He also noted "that it was Jewish 'jazz' that rode in upon the wave

of Negro 'ragtime' popularity, and eventually displaced the 'ragtime,'" which Ford considered a legitimate development of Black music.

An early Jewish promoter of Negro music was Isadore Baline, otherwise known as Irving Berlin, one of the "Izzies" of Tin Pan Alley who became "wealthy through their success in pandering to a public taste which they first debased."[34] Berlin was born in Russia, but after he arrived in New York he became the author of "Vamp" songs and a master of "unashamed erotic suggestion." Irving Berlin, according to Ford, was only following in the footsteps of

> The first self-styled "King of Jazz". . . a Jew named "Frisco." The general directors of the whole downward trend have been Jews. It needed just their touch of cleverness to camouflage the moral filth and raise it half a degree above that natural stage where it begets nothing but disgust. They cannot gild the lily, but they can veil the skunk-cabbage, and that is exactly what has been done. The modern popular song is a whited sepulcher, sparkling without, but within full of the dead bones of all the old disgusting indecencies."[35]

The Jews, according to Ford, used Jazz to corrupt the morals of the majority.

> It is of little use blaming the people. The people are what they are made. Give the liquor business full sway and you have a population that drinks and carouses. After preaching abstinence to the victims for a century, the country turned its attention to the victimizers and the abuse was greatly curtailed. The traffic is still illicitly carried on, but even so, the best way to abolish the illicit traffic is to identify the groups that carry it on. The entire population of the United States could be turned into narcotic addicts if the same freedom was given the illicit narcotic ring as is now given the Yiddish popular song manufacturers. But in such a condition it would be stupid to attack the addicts; common sense would urge the exposure of the panderers.[36]

The popular song is an especially good vehicle for moral corruption because "by sheer dint of repetition and suggestion the song catches on—as a burr thistle catches on."[37]

> The principle is expressed in the words of the song, "Everybody's Doin' It." You go to the theater and hear a song. Next day at lunch the café singer is singing the same song. Blaring phonographs used for advertising purposes blat out the same song at you as you pass on the street. You walk past an afternoon band concert in the park the band is playing the same song. If you are a normal person you have a feeling that perhaps something has been going on in the world while you were engaged with your own affairs. The song – you say to yourself frankly – is silly and the music trivial; but you keep your opinion a secret, because, after all, "everybody's singin' it." Not long after you find yourself humming it.

> You go home, and your daughter is "practicing up" on the piece. It yells its way through your home and through your neighborhood and through your city and through your state until in sheer disgust, and in one day, the people pitch it bodily out-of-doors. But, behold, another song is waiting to take its place – a song fresh from Yiddish Tin Pan Alley. And the agony is repeated. This occurs from 30 to 50 times a year.[38]

The song melody was especially corrupting when it was linked to indecent lyrics of the sort that got sold under the counter and could be substituted for the over-the-counter version when the situation demanded. As anyone who has been unable to drive an advertising jingle out of his mind knows, music enters the soul directly and can be used to carry morally corrupting thoughts with it: "The chances are that the song you are humming today is being hummed by you simply because you have perforce heard it so often that it beats unconsciously within your brain."[39] The process, as Ford pointed out, was largely involuntary. Those thoughts can also be attached to musically degenerated forms, as Plato and the ancients warned. One of the characteristics which both the music Plato condemned and the Negro Jazz shared was syncopation, an element which race music would share with the Jazz of the 1920s and the white imitators of rock 'n roll in the 1960s. "Seductive syncopation [had already] captured the public ear" when Ford wrote his book.

From moral corruption it was a short step to revolution. Ford mentioned Hollywood films as a rehearsal for revolution, but claimed that popular music was an even more effective "way of making 'revolution' as common and as familiar a thought as the movies and popular songs have made 'vamps' and 'harems' and 'hooch' and 'Hula Hula.'"[40]

The moral decline of the 1920s, according to Ford, can be traced to Jewish influence over American culture. Popular music was revolutionary. Jews controlled the industry from top to bottom:

> the Jewish control of the popular song field means that all non-Jews are barred out. It would be next to impossible for the song of a non-Jew, however meritorious, to reach the public by the usual channels. The musical magazines, the musical critics, the musical managers, the music publishers, the music-hall owners, the majority of the performers are not only all Jews, but are Jews consciously banded together to keep out all others.[41]

What was true of Jazz, promoted through vaudeville and sheet music in the 1920s, was *a fortiori* true of race music, rhythm and blues and rock 'n roll in the 1950s.

The record business in the 1950s was a Jewish operation. "Yiddish," Cohodas notes citing an industry insider, "was the second language of the record business."[42]

PAYOLA

By the 1950s what Henry Ford had called "song plugging" in the 1920s was referred to as "payola." Most of the payoffs were informal, via things like the "$100 handshake," but oftentimes payola was more blatant than that:

> WKHM in Detroit offered an "Album of the Week" deal: for $350 the station would play a record 114 times a week with a commercial before and after each play for a minimum of six weeks. Another record company executive told *Time* magazine that under a formula he figured out, it took $22,000 to make a song popular in Chicago. "There are so many people to shmeer," he said, creating a synonym for bribe from a Yiddish word that meant "to spread." "The singer, his manager, the station, the disc jockey."[43]

Cadillac Records portrays the disc jockeys who took payola as a bunch of venal, cigarette-smoking rednecks, when in fact the main beneficiaries were Jews like Alan Freed, the Jewish disc jockey who invented the term "rock 'n roll." By the late '50s, payola had become so widespread and so flagrant, that the government decided to intervene. On November 21, 1959, Alan Freed was fired from his job at WABC in New York. Freed was one of the biggest recipients of payola; he was also one of the biggest promoters of Chess Records. In a letter he wrote to the board of the American Broadcasting Company, the owners of WABC, Freed defended himself by claiming that he had "and shall continue to program records for my show solely and completely on the basis of my evaluation of the records and their appeal to my listening audience."[44]

Cohodas gives some indication of how that evaluation process worked. "You mother f***er," Leonard Chess said to Freed after he showed up at WABC in New York and found that Freed wasn't playing Chess records on his show.

> "What the hell are you playing that guy's record for when I pay you money every week: You know I pay the mortgage up in god-d***ed Connecticut. . . ." When Freed replied that he hadn't gotten anything that week, Leonard was furious. Nonetheless, he walked over to Freed, took a wad of bills out of his pocket, peeled off a few and handed them to the disc jockey along with a stack of new 45s. "Friends," Freed said when he was back on the air, "I've just been visited by my friends from Chicago, Leonard and Phil Chess, and in honor of their presence, this is Chess Records night."[45]

Payola eventually destroyed the career of Alan Freed. Even though he was fined only $500 and sentenced to a six-month suspended jail term, he never regained the audience he had at WABC and died in 1965 "a broken man physically and financially."[46]

Payola meant that Jewish disc jockeys got paid for the songs the Black musicians wrote. Freed got 50 percent of the royalties for "Sincerely," but the most famous example of Jews ripping off of Black talent was Chuck Berry's hit "Maybelline." "Maybelline" was a "crossover" hit, which is to say, it was race music, with all of the moral corruption that genre implied, intended for a white audience. Because it reached a much wider audience, via payola, at places like *Bandstand*, Dick Clark's Philadelphia-based show for white teenagers, Berry stood to earn a lot more money in royalties than Muddy Waters did from his Chicago-based race music.

But when the sheet music for "Maybelline" rolled off the presses in 1955, Berry learned that he was sharing his royalties with two other men, neither of whom had anything to do with writing either the song's melody or its lyrics. One of the "co-authors" of "Maybelline" was Russ Fratto, the landlord of the building where Chess Records was housed. The other co-author of "Maybelline" was none other than Alan Freed.

Marshall Chess claimed that payola was part of the cost of doing business. "It wasn't a matter of right or wrong," he told Cohodas. "It was a matter of survival."[47] Marshall Chess's essentially Talmudic view of payola was one not shared by the former sharecroppers. In fact, it "opened the brothers up to severe criticism and later litigation."[48]

Leonard Chess's way of dealing with the royalty issue was to make Muddy Waters feel "n***er rich." This usually meant peeling off a C-note from the wad of bills Leonard carried around in his pocket and handing it to Muddy Waters whenever the blues singer was broke. But there were other methods. When "Hoochie Coochie Man" made the charts in 1954, Chess bought Muddy Waters a brand new red and white Oldsmobile 98.[49] The undisputed emblem of being n***er rich, however, was the Cadillac, an icon which found its way into the title of the film on Chess Records. In spite of bending over backwards to see some justification for Chess's behavior, Cohodas finds his way of doing business "uncomfortably close to sharecropping" with the label functioning as "the company store," and the musician as the "employee/sharecropper."[50]

A close second to the Cadillac, as the Chicago version of the company store, was "taking care of musicians' other needs," as when "Leonard made available his personal lawyer, Nate Notkin, to handle Waters's paternity suits." Water's legal fees were deducted from his royalties according to a schedule that Waters never saw. Bo Diddley, another Black musician from the South who recorded for Chess Records, had similar complaints. "Bo Diddley ain't got sh*t," he told *Rolling Stone* magazine in 1987. "My records are sold all over the world, and I ain't got a f***ing dime. . . . When I left Chess Records . . . they said I owed them $125,000."[51]

By the time the '70s rolled around, the grumbling had morphed into lawsuits. In 1974 Howlin' Wolf filed a lawsuit against Arc Music, the music publishing company the Chess brothers owned with Benny Goodman and his

brother, asking for $2.5 million in damages for unpaid royalties on his songs. The two sides reached an undisclosed monetary settlement after Wolf's death in 1976. In 1976 Muddy Waters and Willie Dixon "filed identical lawsuits against the publishing company, alleging fraud and conspiracy and asking to be paid money damages and to have their publishing contracts voided."[52]

Cohodas does her best to view the accounting practices at Chess Records in a positive light: "The musicians believed they deserved more than they got. Leonard and Phil believed they treated them fairly. They played by the rules of the time."[53] Her efforts are undermined by the fact that the accounting practices at Chess Records all took place in the head of Phil Chess. There are no surviving written accounts because there were never any written accounts. The accounts, if we can call the evanescent figures in Phil Chess's mind by that name, disappeared when Phil Chess died. Even in trying to defend the Chess brothers' accounting procedures, Cohodas is forced to concede that, "The relationships could be paternalistic, even condescending. At Chess it sometimes looks as though Leonard and Phil gave their musicians an allowance rather than a salary."[54] Paternalism filled in where accounting left off. Phil Chess claims that they treated their Negro singers "like they were your children," because that is how "they wanted to be" treated, at least in his mind. "They used to come to you whenever they had a problem," Phil Chess continued, "If one had his wife having a baby in one hospital and his old lady in another, they come to you to pay the bills so his old lady wouldn't know. . . . As time went by, it was 'You know this wasn't right, that wasn't right,' which I'm not gonna dispute. I'm not gonna defend. I know in my mind what it was and that's it."[55]

Whether it was paternalism or sexual liberation as a form of control, the charge that the Chess brothers cheated the Mississippians dogged their business from its inception and contributed to the animosity which eventually led to the collapse of the Black-Jewish alliance in the late '60s. Cohodas claims that the "stereotype of the crafty, even rapacious Jew played into the disputes that arose later over royalties and contracts: Jews were about money, smart but not to be trusted."[56]

Harold Cruse, whose book, *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, did more to bring about the demise of that alliance than any other work, gives evidence that the Black attitude toward Jews as "rapacious" was based on something more than stereotypes. Cruse, it should be remembered, was struggling to get his musical plays produced on Broadway during the same period that Muddy Waters and Chuck Berry were being cheated out of their royalties by the Chess Brothers. Cruse felt that the Negro had been cheated out of his musical patrimony largely because of his own unfortunate experiences in dealing with Jewish music producers in New York. America has never "produced a black Gershwin," according to Cruse, because Jewish "publishers have used and exploited the Negro composer unmercifully. This pattern has

continued up to the present."[57] Duke Ellington was denied a Pulitzer Prize in 1965, because, according to Cruse, "the Gershwin-type musicians achieved status and recognition in the 1920s for music that they literally stole outright from Harlem nightclubs. . . . The role of the Negro, as entertainer, has not changed since the 1920s. In 1967, the Negro entertainer is still being used, manipulated, and exploited by whites (predominantly Jewish whites)."[58]

The talk about royalties obscures the role Jews played in the moral corruption of the culture in general and of their musicians in particular. Jews inherited the term "race music," but they soon started fiddling with the terminology and the music to make it more appealing to white audiences. Jerry Wexler, head of Atlantic Records, changed the term "race music" into "rhythm and blues," and Alan Freed, the Jewish disc jockey who was one of the biggest casualties of the payola scandal, did him one better by changing "rhythm and blues" into "rock 'n roll."

Muddy Waters was never anything but a blues singer with a limited, racially defined constituency on the South Side of Chicago. His successor at Chess Records, the man who made race music acceptable to white teenagers, was Chuck Berry. As one indication of his crossover appeal, Chuck Berry appeared on Dick Clark's Philadelphia-based TV show for white teenagers, *American Bandstand*. As another indication, Jerry Wexler and Ahmet Ehrtegun, the men who ran Atlantic Records, "observed that the rhythm and blues sound was changing to a more pop feel in response to the growing potential of the white teenage market."[59]

On October 28, 1961 Chuck Berry lost his last appeal in a conviction for transporting a minor across state lines for immoral purposes and went to prison. Cohodas claims that "Leonard and Phil had been very concerned about Berry's troubles,"[60] but she adds that "Berry had no such memory in his rendition of events in his autobiography." Cohodas goes out of her way to explain that the 14-year-old girl whom Chuck Berry brought to St. Louis for immoral purposes was an Apache Indian, which is to say, that she was not white. *Cadillac Records*, however, dwells on Berry's sexual exploits with white girls. In case the point of Berry's sexual adventures with white girls in the back seat of his Cadillac might be lost on an audience that has come to expect this sort of behavior from its musical idols, *Cadillac Records* deals with the political implications of Berry's music as well. At the beginning of one concert, the Black and white teenagers are separated by red velvet ropes. Once Berry's music kicks in, however, Dionysian frenzy ensues, and the rope barriers are overwhelmed by one large mass of interracial gyrating teenagers, some of whom come up on stage, to the consternation of the police, and start gyrating with Chuck Berry.

The point of the Berry concert vignette in *Cadillac Records* is to show how race music fostered integration and the overturning of an unjust social order, but it also indicates that the music itself had a morally corrupting influence

on the teenagers, both Black and white, who listened to it. Race music began as a chronicle of the moral degradation which followed the Black migration from Mississippi to Chicago. It then morphed into a vehicle for the moral corruption of white teenagers. If Chuck Berry was known as a purveyor of "black hillbilly" music, Elvis Presley was the mirror image of the same thing, a white guy who sang like a Negro. Elvis became a household word in 1957, the same year that Norman Mailer's essay "The White Negro" appeared in the *Partisan Review*. Even though Mailer was talking about jazz and Beatniks, no one fit the white Negro bill better than Elvis. Sam Phillips, the man who was to Elvis and Sun Records what Leonard Chess was to Chuck Berry and Chess Records, got the idea of musical miscegenation that Berry and Chess were promoting and put it into practice from the perspective of a white southerner who was as avid to make money off of teenagers as the Jews in Chicago were. "White Youngsters," he claimed "weren't sure whether they ought to like it [race music] or not" when Black musicians performed the music. As a result, Philips "got thinking how many records you could sell if you could find white performers who could play and sing in this same exciting, alive way." Cohodas claims that "Disc jockey Alan Freed believed the same thing, only he was cultivating a white market for the Black performers who made the music he loved as much as Philips did."[61] She also deals with the sexually subversive nature of Berry's music by ascribing the very idea to southern racists. Cohodas, however, concedes the point white southerners were trying to make on more than one occasion. Berry, she tells us,

> would have violated every racial-sexual taboo. Berry himself appreciated the racial-sexual borders, if for no other reason than his occasional scrapes with southern sheriffs angry and unsettled by his popularity among southern white women only too happy to share his company. Sam Phillips had also understood, and perhaps in their own way Leonard and Phil had too.[62]

The point of this music, in other words, was to violate "racial-sexual borders." At a Bo Diddley concert in Myrtle Beach, South Carolina, one of the sidemen jumped off the stage only to find himself surrounded by white women eager to violate these racial-sexual taboos. Sensing that "racial decorum had been violated," and that moral subversion was a prelude to revolution, the police, "all of them white," shut down the performance. When Marshall Chess asked what was going on, he was called a "Jew N***er Lover," and told "We're going to lock you up and it will take them weeks to find you."

When the revolution arrived in Chicago, Leonard Chess was one of its first victims. By the late 1960s, the South Side of Chicago was a dangerous place for Polish immigrants. Chess was beaten by Black assailants more than once. *Cadillac Records* portrays Leonard's beating as politically motivated. Cohodas finds this inexplicable because Chess supported the NAACP, which she fails

to see as a Jewish organization which had enraged militant Blacks by the time the '60s rolled around by its duplicitous promotion of integration for Blacks and ethnic solidarity for Jews.

The revolution always devours its own Jews, and the sexual revolution of the '60s, with its Negro sound track, was no exception. The Chess Brothers had fomented a revolution that was going to swallow them among its first victims. Sensing that their time had passed, Leonard Chess decided to sell out:

> He told Marshall that it was getting more and more difficult for white people to own a company geared to black consumers. Jesse Jackson was pressuring Chess, just as he was pressuring other companies that did business in the black community, to hire blacks in senior positions.[63]

Corruption was a two-way street. Marshall Chess, Leonard's son, recalled being shocked when he learned that Willie Dixon had "two wives and two families."[64] "I don't feel it's no disgrace for a man because it's forty cows to one bull."[65] The record business may have been good to Leonard and Phil, but it was not good for the next generation of the Chess family. As a result of his involvement in the record business his father had founded, Marshall Chess ended up a drug addict. His sister Susie died of a drug overdose in 1973, and his only other sibling died in 1976 from complications following surgery.

Leonard Chess died of a fatal heart attack on October 16, 1969. Two months later, Chicago police stormed Black Panther headquarters and killed Fred Hampton.

Chapter Two

L'Affaire Williamson

The Catholic Church and Holocaust Denial

Christianity clears up the mystery which hangs over Judaism, accounting fully for the punishment of the people by specifying their sin, their heinous sin. If, instead of hailing their own Messiah, they crucified Him, then the strange scourge which has pursued them after the deed, and the energetic wording of the curse before it, are explained by the very strangeness of their guilt;—or rather, their sin is their punishment; for in rejecting their Divine King, they *ipso facto* lost their living principle and their nationality."

– John Henry Cardinal Newman
An Essay in Aid of a Grammar of Assent

"Oh, you're German. I'm sorry. I thought there was something wrong with you."

– Basil Fawlty
Fawlty Towers

"Well, the police may come for Richard Williamson and hand him over for deportation proceedings.

– Thomas W. Case
"The Society of Pius X Gets Sick," *Fidelity*, October 1992

On Wednesday, January 21, 2009, in the middle of the week which the Church has traditionally used to promote Christian unity, Pope Benedict XVI signed a letter announcing that he intended to lift the excommunications imposed on the bishops in charge of the Society of St. Pius X, taking a major step toward ending the almost 21-year-old schism that began on June 30, 1988 when Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre, along with Bishop Antonio Castro de Mayer, illicitly consecrated Bernard Fellay, Bernard Tissier de Mallerais, Alfonso de Galaretta, and Richard Williamson in a ceremony at the SSPX seminary in Econe, Switzerland. On July 1, 1988, one day after

the illicit consecrations, Cardinal Bernardin Gantin, the then head of the Congregation of Bishops in Rome, announced that all six men had incurred excommunication *latae sententiae*, the penalty laid down in the revised Code of Canon Law, Canon 1382, for directly participating in an episcopal consecration in the absence of a papal mandate.

According to the January 21, 2009 document, Bishop Fellay, the Superior General of the Society had written in December to Cardinal Dario Castrillon-Hoyos, Prefect of the Ecclesia Dei commission, requesting the removal of the excommunications. Fellay claimed that, "We are always firmly determined in our will to remain Catholic and to place all our efforts at the service of the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ, which is the Roman Catholic Church. We accept its teachings with filial animus. We believe firmly in the Primacy of Peter and its prerogatives, and for this the current situation makes us suffer so much."[1]

Pope Benedict decided to lift the excommunications in order to promote unity in the Church: "This gift of peace at the end of the Christmas celebrations, is also intended to be a sign to promote unity in the charity of the universal Church and to try to vanquish the scandal of division." ("With peace like this," we can imagine the pope muttering to himself a few days later, "who needs war?")

Serious efforts to end the Lefebvre schism began in April 2005, when Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger became pope. Cardinal Ratzinger had always been sympathetic to widespread use of the old Mass, a cause dear to traditionalists. Two years into his pontificate Benedict lifted all remaining restrictions on the celebration of the *Vetus Ordo*, when he issued the *motu proprio Summorum Pontificium* on July 7, 2007.

Bishop Fellay met with Pope Benedict at Castel Gandolfo on August 29, 2005, only four months after Benedict's election, and from that moment discussions started in earnest for the removal of the excommunications. On June 4, 2008, Cardinal Castrillon-Hoyos set several conditions to be met by the SSPX to facilitate a lifting of the excommunications. All of them had to do with schism, which is based on lack of charity; none of them had anything remotely to do with the Holocaust.

In November 2008 Bishop Fellay led a pilgrimage to Lourdes, during which he asked the faithful to pray the rosary to have the excommunications lifted. On January 21, 2009 his prayers were answered when he received the letter from Giovanni Battista Re remitting the excommunications. Re mentioned in his letter that the gesture was intended "to be a sign to promote unity in the charity of the universal Church and to try to end the scandal of division." Re also mentioned the hope that this gesture would "be followed by the prompt accomplishment of full communion with the Church of the entire Society of St. Pius X, thus testifying true fidelity and true recognition of the Magisterium and of the authority of the Pope with the proof of visible unity."

Bishop Fellay responded by expressing his "filial gratitude to the Holy Father for this gesture," which he hoped would help "to remedy the unprecedented crisis which presently shakes the Catholic world, and which Pope John Paul II had designated as a state of 'silent apostasy.'" The message of the pope's gesture was clear to Fellay: "Tradition will no longer be stigmatized."

"Thanks to this gesture," Fellay continued, "Catholics attached to Tradition throughout the world will no longer be unjustly stigmatized and condemned for having kept the Faith of their fathers. Catholic tradition is no longer excommunicated. Though it never was in itself, it was often excommunicated and cruelly so in day to day events." In his response, Fellay stressed his and the SSPX's loyalty, as well as a willingness to work toward resolving:

> the unprecedented crisis which is shaking the Church today: crisis of vocations, crisis of religious practice, of catechism, of the reception of the sacraments . . . Before us Paul VI went so far as to say that "from some fissure the smoke of Satan had entered the Church," and he spoke of the "self-destruction of the Church." John Paul II did not hesitate to say that Catholicism in Europe was, as it were, in a state of "silent apostasy." Shortly before his election to the Throne of Peter, Benedict XVI compared the Church to a "boat taking water on every side." We are ready to write the Creed with our own blood, to sign the anti-modernist oath, the profession of faith of Pius IV, we accept and make our own all the councils up to the Second Vatican Council about which we express some reservations.

Some pundits, however, felt there was a contradiction between the two assertions, i.e., between professions of loyalty and recognition that an "unprecedented crisis is shaking the Church today." Neoconservative George Weigel was one of those pundits. Weigel took issue with Fellay's reservations about Vatican II, claiming that "Responsible canon lawyers have raised questions about whether this arrogance [reservations about Vatican II] on the part of Bishop Fellay does not cast in question his fulfillment of the canonical requirements for a lawful lifting of his excommunication."[2]

Weigel puts in words a spectre which would haunt the discussion surrounding the lifting of the excommunications, namely, that in some circles of the Church the profession of Faith had been replaced by a profession of faith in Vatican II. Vatican II was not just one council among many, according to this view. It become a shibboleth and the *sine qua non* of Church membership. Once it had been proposed as the substitute for the Creed, Vatican II then got reduced to the documents which were supposed to support the political agenda of the person doing the reducing. In the case of American neocons like Weigel, the Catholic Faith, became by way of synecdoche, Vatican II statements on the Jews and religious liberty. If Bishop Fellay expressed reservations about Vatican II, this was an indication to Weigel "that the

healing has not taken place. . . . Moreover, Fellay's letter raises the stakes for everyone, and to the highest level. For what is at issue now, is the integrity of the Church's self-understanding, which must include the authenticity of the teaching of Vatican II." Weigel found it difficult "to see how the unity of the Catholic Church will be advanced if the Lefebvrist faction does not publicly and unambiguously affirm Vatican Council II's teaching on the nature of the church, on religious freedom, and on the sin of anti-Semitism."

"How," Weigel wondered in a comment to *The Washington Post*, "does this advance the unity of the church if they are reconciled [without embracing church positions on religious freedom and anti-Semitism?] This really has the possibility of unraveling a lot of the accomplishments of the John Paul and Benedict periods if not handled well." All of the themes were introduced in the overture of this opera, which would revolve around but not resolve the related issues of tradition and anti-Semitism. Was anti-Semitism part of the Catholic DNA? Did Vatican II trump the Gospel of St. John? Or did it have to be read in the light of the Gospels?

On Thursday, January 22, within minutes of the leaking on the Internet of the announcement that the excommunications of the four bishops were to be lifted, reports that Bishop Williamson was a "Holocaust denier" began circulating on the web as well. These reports referred to an interview conducted months before in Germany but to be broadcast the following day on Swedish TV.

In his interview, Williamson did not deny the suffering of the Jewish people at the hands of the Nazi regime, but he did question the details of the Holocaust narrative, concerning the numbers of people who died at Auschwitz and how they died. In doing this he broke the law in Germany and earned himself the epithet "Holocaust denier."

"Pope Rehabilitates Holocaust Denier" is the headline *Reuters* used to frame the issue. Once framed that way, the intent of the story became clear. *L'affaire Williamson* was born as a combination of the Danish cartoon story and the media-orchestrated uproar among Muslims over the pope's Regensburg speech. The "Pope Rehabilitates Holocaust Denier" incident was a replay of the media-inspired frenzy, which took place in the wake of the pope's September 2006 Regensburg speech, over the pope's quote from Emperor Manuel Paleologos. Once the term "Holocaust denier" got broached, the story took on a life of its own, and that life had nothing to do with the pope's intention, namely, to heal a schism and promote unity. In fact, the point of this story was to prevent the schism from being healed by proposing a counter-morality based on a counter-magisterium based on the dogmas of political correctness.

In spite of the Vatican's efforts to the contrary, news reports kept confusing the Church's focus on the sin of schism with the media world's focus on the unforgivable secular sin, i.e., "Holocaust denial" and anti-Semitism. The

media could be forgiven for their ignorance since theologians were failing to make the appropriate distinctions too. Wolfgang Beinert, a student of the pope who now occupies the same chair the pope held at the University of Regensburg, faulted his former mentor for breaking what he termed a 2000-year old tradition in the Church. Up until a week ago, Ratzinger's successor at Regensburg opined, "Groups which stood in contradiction to the pope had to recant their positions before they were readmitted to the church." Beinert here seems to be referring to the "sin" of Holocaust denial rather than the sin of schism because, he "doubts that Rome was unaware of Williamson's views." Beinert was evidently unaware that the bishops had signed a statement repudiating schism. Either that, or he considered Holocaust denial a greater sin. If Catholics were confused it was understandable. Evidently even theologians were having a hard time keeping their sins straight.

The Swedish TV interview had been in the can for months but it got released within minutes of the announcement that the pope intended to lift the excommunications. Sources close to the SSPX in Sweden had been warning them during the fall of 2008 that they were being set up by the TV journalist Ali Fegan and the people associated with the Swedish National TV show "*Uppdrag granskning*" ("Mission Examination"). The SSPX's Father Morgan, however, continued cooperating evidently feeling that Swedish National Television was interested in filming the ordination of the Swedish SSPX seminarian Sten Sandmarks at the SSPX seminary in Zaitskofen, Bavaria, which is where Bishop Williamson was interviewed on November 1, 2008 when he made his comments about how many people died in Auschwitz. Evidence that Williamson trusted the Swedish film crew is evident on the film itself when Williamson says, naively, "You realize you can get me in prison for that. I hope that is not your intention."

Once Fegan and the "*Uppdrag granskning*" crew had Williamson's interview in the can they traveled around Sweden showing it to the various groups which rented their facilities to the SSPX claiming that if they continued to rent their facilities to the SSPX they would be indicted as Holocaust deniers as well. The Anglican Church in Stockholm succumbed to these pressures and canceled their contract with the SSPX.

Not content to leave it at that, the "*Uppdrag granskning*" crew then showed the Williamson film clip to other SSPX clergymen, putting them in the unenviable situation of either denouncing Bishop Williamson in public or incriminating themselves in the crime of "Holocaust denial." According to the same source which tried to warn the SSPX in the fall of 2008, Holocaust denial is "here in Sweden the worst sin and crime you can possibly commit, according to the gramscian-leftist Jewish-owned Swedish media establishment." The word of the set up had gone out through the SSPX by late November or early December. We know this because the same source wrote that "I hope and pray that this TV-program will not be broadcasted

[*sic*] before Christmas—then we would have some time to prepare ourselfs [*sic*] for this fight."

Italian journalists writing for *Il Reformista* and *Il Giornale* were claiming that the Williamson affair was the result of a conspiracy between Ali Fegan and the Swedish national TV network and the French journalist and Lesbian activist Fiametta Venner who had written a book, *Les Nouveaux Soldats du Pape*, attacking the SSPX in France and an unnamed official in the Vatican, with good contacts in Scandinavia, who wanted to thwart the re-union. The bishop of Sweden, Anders Arborelius, OCD, was no friend of the SSPX and clearly upset by the SSPX's campaign to reconvert Sweden to the Catholic Faith. Arborelius spoke of inclusivity as the chief characteristic of Catholicism, something clearly at odds with racism and intolerance, which he seemed to imply was motivating the SSPX in its attempts to convert the Swedes. By the end of the first week of the controversy, Vatican Spokesman Federico Lombardi was one of the few people who still claimed that the timing of the reversal of Williamson's excommunication and the Swedish broadcast were "absolutely unrelated."

The folks at "*Uppdrag granskning*," however, had bigger fish to fry than disrupting the SSPX's Christmas holiday or defending Swedes from proselytism. The interview showed up on the Internet within minutes of the announcement lifting the excommunications indicating that the timing was intended to disrupt the healing of the Lefebvre schism. That became obvious when the Anti-Defamation League got involved.

On January 23, one day before the announcement was officially promulgated, the ADL issued a press release whose intent, to thwart the lifting of the excommunications, was clear from their headline: "ADL to Vatican: Do Not Rehabilitate Holocaust Denier Bishop." When the first ADL press release failed to derail the lifting of the excommunications, the ADL followed up one day later with another press release: "ADL disappointed in Pope's Decision to Rehabilitate Holocaust Denier Bishop." In the second ADL press release Abe Foxman claimed that Benedict's decision to lift the excommunications "undermines the strong relationship between Catholics and Jews that flourished under Pope John Paul II and which Benedict said he would continue when he came into his papacy." Foxman then mentioned Vatican II and "the centuries-long history of anti-Semitism in the Church," which Vatican II was supposed to redress, claiming that Pope Benedict's action was "a most troubling setback."

If anyone had any doubts about the purpose behind the ADL press releases, Charlotte Knobloch, president of the German Council of Jews, laid them to rest when she told the *Rheinische Post* in Germany, "I would like an outcry in the church against such actions from the pope."

Der Spiegel, Germany's socialist weekly, then began orchestrating that outcry, putting the pope on the cover of the next week's issue along with the

claim that the "German pope had embarrassed the Church." In the January 26, 2009 issue of *Spiegel Online International*, Rabbi David Rosen, head of the American Jewish Committee, was quoted as saying, "In welcoming an open Holocaust denier into the Catholic Church without any recantation on his part, the Vatican has made a mockery of John Paul II's moving and impressive repudiation and condemnation of anti-Semitism." The vice president of the Central Council of Jews, Dieter Graumann, accused the pope of an "incomprehensible act of provocation. The fact that it is of all things a German pope who conjured up this new ice age between Jews and the Catholic Church . . . that is something particularly painful, astonishing, and deplorable."

Germany's newspapers followed the lead set by the world's major Jewish organizations, which is to say, they condemned the pope's actions via appeals to Vatican II and invidious comparisons between Benedict and his predecessor, as when the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung* wrote: "it remains a mystery why the pope is now making such concessions to the fanatical opponents of the Second Vatican Council, that he is making a mockery of his predecessor John Paul II's insistence on obedience to the teachings of the church and to the pope."

Two weeks after the pope signed the letter lifting the excommunications, *Der Spiegel* was still on his case, this time for appointing Gerhard Maria Wagner as auxiliary bishop in Linz. Wagner had earned the ire of *Spiegel* because he has "a knack for inappropriate comments," including "claiming in 2005 in a parish newsletter" that "Hurricane Katrina was an act of 'divine retribution' for New Orleans' permissive ways." Wagner had similarly inappropriate views about *Harry Potter* books and the tsunami in Thailand. Taken altogether these views rendered Wagner unacceptable as a bishop, according to *Der Spiegel.*

Why does *Spiegel* have a dog in this fight? Who gave a socialist magazine in Germany veto rights over who the pope appoints as auxiliary bishop in Linz? Does this mean the Church has veto rights the next time a *Spiegel* sympathizer like Guenther Grass gets nominated for a Nobel Prize?

Before long, anyone who had an agenda and was willing to dump on the pope got a hearing in the German press. On a normal news day at *Der Spiegel*, German theologian Hans Kueng was treated with dismissive condescension if not contempt. Years ago, *Spiegel* reported on a phone call Kueng received after Pope John Paul I died. A Vatican official was on the other end of the line wondering if Kueng would like to become pope. After considering the proposition for a moment Kueng declined the honor, explaining "If I were pope, I'd no longer be infallible."

But that was then. Now *Der Spiegel* was rehabilitating Kueng, Germany's great prophet, and Kueng responded by producing what had to be the most moronic piece of journalism generated by the entire Williamson affair, namely, "If Obama were Pope." "It is no coincidence that the Pope celebrated

his 81st birthday in the White House," Kueng hinted darkly. "Both Bush and Ratzinger are unteachable in matters of birth control and abortion, disinclined to implement any serious reforms, arrogant and without transparency in the way in which they exercise their office, restricting freedoms and human rights." By lifting the schism, Pope Benedict "has confirmed all the fears which arose when he was elected pope." Before long, Kueng's agenda came to the fore: "What would a Pope do who acted in the spirit of Obama?" Well, he would do what Hans Kueng has been complaining about for decades now, namely, "he could authorize contraception over night, permit the marriage of priests, make possible the ordination of women and allow Eucharistic fellowship with Protestant churches." What this had to do with Holocaust denial or schism wasn't immediately clear. What was clear, though, was *Spiegel*'s attempt to mobilize Hans Kueng's German fifth column as a way of weakening the pope's authority. The veiled threat was becoming clearer with each intemperate outburst: admit the SSPX and the German Left will leave the Church.

Reaction from Germany was vehement to the point of hysteria. It was as if the fact that the pope was German somehow obliged them to be anti-Catholic in the same way that the Holocaust obliged them to be anti-German. Beyond that, there was the undeniable fact that Germany had criminalized the thought crime of Holocaust denial in 1994. If the pope failed to condemn "Holocaust denial," it put German Catholics in legal jeopardy, but did Germany have a jail big enough for 20 million Catholics? That seemed a bit far-fetched. But the thought of revocation of the "*Kirchensteuer*," the tax money the German government paid to the Church, was enough to send shivers down the spines of theologians and bishops. Hence, the uproar. Walter Cardinal Kasper tried to play the whole thing down, attributing the biggest church-state crisis in Germany since the Reformation to "management errors." But the theologians were having none of this.

Hermann Haering, a liberal German Catholic theologian, said that the pope should resign "for the good of the Church." Werner Thissen, bishop of Hamburg, claimed that the lifting of the excommunications had led to "a loss of confidence in the pope." Christoph Schoenborn, bishop of Vienna, came close to claiming that Bishop Williamson had committed the unforgivable sin, when he opined that "he who denies the Holocaust cannot be rehabilitated within the Church." Gerhard Ludwig Mueller, the bishop in Pope Benedict's home city of Regensburg, outdid Schoenborn in fraternal charity by announcing that Williamson would not be welcome in its churches.

The lack of support that the pope had among his fellow German bishops became even more apparent when their spokesman Matthias Kopp appeared on German television. Matthias Kopp claimed that because Pope John Paul II signed a concordat with Israel in 1993 (an agreement which Israel has yet to honor) the Church has obligated itself to "fight every form of anti-

Semitism." Kopp, however, failed to define even one form of anti-semitism, thereby playing into the hands of organizations like the ADL. "Every form of anti-Semitism" (*jede Form des Antisemitismus*) long ago became another word for Jewish hegemony over the Church because the operative definition of anti-Semitism invariably ends up be the definition promoted by groups like the ADL and Abe Foxman. This means that the Church must adopt Jewish categories in its internal governance, which in turn means that schism takes a back seat to "Holocaust denial" when it comes to defining the gravity of the sin.

Kopp pressed further into the theological equivalent of *terra incognita* when he asserted that the Church had to censure Bishop Williamson, because combating "every form of anti-Semitism" now "belongs to the Magisterium of the Church" ("*Das sind Elemente, die zur Lehre der Kirche dazugehoeren*"). The press secretary of the German Bishops' Conference claimed that the Holocaust was now part of Catholic dogma. Taking his cue on Church teaching from a law passed in Germany in 1994, Kopp concludes that "the Holocaust cannot be denied." The reasoning goes as follows: "The Holocaust is not denied by the Church. Therefore, a bishop who has returned to the Church after 20 years of schism cannot deny the holocaust. . . . He must conform to the teaching of the Church" ("*Also hat er sich der Lehre der Kirche anzupassen.*")[3] The fact that Kopp lives in a country which has outlawed historical research on certain topics does not change the fact that the Church can pronounce infallibly on matters of faith and morals but has no mandate whatsoever to pass judgments on historical matters like how many people died in concentration camps and how they died, the matters which Bishop Williamson brought up in his interview. In matters where she cannot speak authoritatively, the Church allows the faithful to form their own opinions, everywhere it seems but in Germany.

Spiegel accused the Vatican of having an "an apparent tin ear" (a phrase which probably lost something in the translation) on matters dealing with the Jews, homosexuals, women, etc. etc., and as an example of this "tin ear" mentioned "moves to have the war-time Pope Pius XII, who is accused by some of having turned a blind eye to the mass deportation and murder of Jews, named a saint."

The status of Pius XII was especially *apropos* in this regard. I'm tempted to say that his cause has been in Limbo ever since the Jews objected, except that Pope Benedict XVI doesn't believe in Limbo. The status of the causes of Pius XII and Father Dehon crossed my mind while attending a lecture by Archbishop Angelo Amato, prefect for the Congregation for the Causes of the Saints, who spoke on secularism in Europe at Notre Dame, the same week *l'affaire Williamson* was raging in the press. Rather than listen to the archbishop shadow box with secularism, it would have been much more interesting to hear him explain how organized Jewry (hereafter, the Jews)

had gained veto power over whom the Catholics were allowed to name as saints. The case of Pius XII, whose canonization is on hold, as well as the still unresolved case of Father Dehon, whose canonization was postponed because the Jews accused him of anti-semitism, are only two cases in point. What implications did this stance have for Church unity throughout history? Would it be possible, I wondered, for St. John Chrysostom to be canonized by the Church today? Certainly not, if *Adversos Iudeos* had to be vetted by the Italian Rabbis or Abe Foxman.

The unspoken but all-pervasive issue at the heart of *l'affaire Williamson* came down to a question of who was running the Catholic Church and whose dogmas had the final say in Church governance. Did Jewish concern over Holocaust denial trump what Canon 1382 had to say about schism? If so why? Or were the Jews simply using this as an excuse to promote more division in the Church? Williamson himself had said on Dioscopus.blogspot.com that "the media uproar was surely timed and orchestrated to block the decree." The Jews, once again, were promoting division. Since the lifting of the excommunications was only the first step in repairing the Lefebvrite schism, the media attack was meant to ensure that that complete reconciliation would not happen.

Undeterred by the ADL's threat and their orchestration of the world media against the Church, the Vatican released the letter lifting the excommunications on Saturday, January 24. The Vatican's initial statements showed calm and resolve by trying to separate the two issues the Jews and the world press were determined to conflate, namely, schism and Holocaust denial. "This act regards the lifting of the excommunications, period," Vatican spokesman Father Federico Lombardi told reporters, "It has nothing to do with the personal opinions of one person, which are open to criticism, but are not pertinent to this decree."

On January 28 at the end of his general audience on Wednesday, the pope reiterated the reasons that led to the lifting of the excommunications, none of which had anything to do with the Holocaust or how many people died or how they died:

> Precisely in order to fulfill the service of unity, which distinguished in a special way my ministry as Successor of Peter, I decided a number of days ago to grant the remission of the excommunication that four bishops had incurred when they were ordained by Archbishop Lefebvre in 1988 without a pontifical mandate. I carried out this action of paternal tenderness because these bishops had repeatedly expressed to me their acute suffering over the situation in which they found themselves. I hope that this gesture of mine will be followed by concerted effort on their part to take the further steps necessary to realize full communion with the Church, testifying in this way to their true fidelity and true recognition of the magisterium and authority of the Pope and of Vatican Council II.

He concluded his daily Wednesday audience by saying that he wanted to "express my full and indisputable solidarity with our Brothers and Sisters who received the First Covenant, I trust that the memory of the Shoah will induce humankind to reflect upon the unpredictable power of evil when it conquers the heart of man."

The reports in the press invariably involved a skewing of the pope's words. Michelle Boorstein, writing for the *Washington Post*, wrote that Benedict told "pilgrims in his weekly audience in Vatican City that he feels 'full and indisputable' solidarity with Jews and repudiating the idea of denying the Holocaust."

"If the pope is in full solidarity with the Jews," one Catholic wondered after reading the report in the *Washington Post*, "where does that leave us [Catholics]? Should we all become Jews?"

Boorstein went on to claim that Williamson "denied that the Holocaust occurred" when in fact (as she herself mentioned) his statements, however, lamentable, had to do with numbers and technicalities. The pope fared no better in Boorstein's account, an account full of misrepresentations like the following:

> In his short tenure as pope, Benedict has caused concerns among other faith leaders before. He sparked deadly riots across the Muslim world in 2006 by citing a 14th century characterization of the prophet Muhammad as "evil and inhuman." Jewish groups protested in 2007 when he expanded use of traditional liturgy—a priority among groups such as St. Pius X—that on Good Friday called for Catholics to pray for "the faithless Jews." After protests, the next year he required all Catholics to remove the word "faithless."[4]

The Boorstein account in the *Washington Post* blundered from one error to another. It became difficult to dismiss her ineptitude as simple incompetence. "Catholic officials," Boorstein continued, "say anti-Semitic comments by any of the bishops, while possibly abhorrent, are not heretical." The statement ignored the fact that no one in the Church had raised the issue of (much less defined the term) anti-semitism, nor had anyone explained how questioning the details of how Jews died was anti-semitic, according to any definition of the term.

As the volume of the outcry increased, Vatican resolve began to crumble, and comments began to proliferate, making a bad situation worse. As if to show that Rome could shoot itself in the foot without the help of the *Washington Post*, *L'Osservatore Romano* published an article by Anna Foa, a Jewish professor of history at the University of Rome "*La Sapienza*," on the topic of "*Negazionismo*," the Italian term for Holocaust denial. Foa's article, "Anti-Semitism is the only motive of the Deniers," was so apodictic it made papal bulls look like models of empirical induction by comparison. In contrast

to the measured approach of Raul Hilberg, the Jewish dean of Holocaust studies, Foa, offering no evidence other than her ability as a mind reader, dismissed David Irving's credentials as an historian. She claimed that "Anti-Jewish hatred is at the origin of this denial. . . . There is only one motive, one intention, behind denial of the Holocaust: antisemtism. All the rest is lies."

On January 27, 2009, Bishop Bernard Fellay, the Superior General of the Society of St. Pius X, joined the Vatican's efforts at damage control when he announced that Bishop Williamson had been silenced. "Our Society claims no authority over historical or other secular matters," Fellay wrote. If so, then why was the Society silencing him, since what Williamson said could not be construed as heretical or contrary to faith or morals? Again it came down to a question of who had the right to declare an action sinful, the Church or the World.

Writing from a traditionalist perspective, Christopher Ferrara had similar difficulties distinguishing between what the Church considers important and where she leaves her children the freedom to make up their own minds. Ferrara took issue with Andrew Rabel, who claimed

> The SSPX reverts to the penalties given by Rome prior to the episcopal consecrations and all four bishops in the Society remain suspended *a divinis*. The society remains a group of Catholics in an irregular state. No chapel of the SSPX in the world is in communion with the Universal Church, and its priests sharing in the suspension are deprived of the clerical state (a separate matter from the validity of their ordinations). They cannot offer the sacraments of matrimony and penance validly because that requires faculties from a local bishop. . . But a significant hurdle in the way of full ecclesial communion for the Society, appears to have been removed.

Ferrara disputed the claims made by both George Weigel and Andrew Rabel, that the society remained in "an irregular state" but in so doing involved himself in bizarre self-contradictions. Ferrara claimed that the pope's action proved that the SSPX was never in schism in the first place, a claim which causes one to wonder why Ferrara is rejoicing at the lifting of the excommunications. In trying to explain his position, Ferrara confuses the issue, as for instance when he writes:

> To begin with, it can no longer be said by anyone in good faith that the four surviving bishops of the Society are "in schism." Further, those who have spent the past twenty years calumniating the priests and lay adherents of the Society as "schismatics" have finally been deprived of even the pretense of a canonical basis for this insult.

Well, which is it? If there was nothing irregular about the state of the SSPX, why are we all rejoicing at the lifting of the excommunications? Brian Mershon attempted to bring clarity to the situation by writing to Msgr. Camille Perl,

vice president of the Pontifical Commission Ecclesia Dei, who responded on May 23, 2008. In response to the question of whether the society is in schism, Perl refers to the Episcopal ordinations as "schismatic" but then adds

> While it is true that participation in the Mass at chapels of the Society of St. Pius X does not of itself constitute "formal adherence to the schism" (cf. Ecclesia Dei 5, c), such adherence can come about over a period of time as one slowly imbibes a schismatic mentality which separates itself from the teaching of the Supreme Pontiff and the entire Catholic Church. While we hope and pray for a reconciliation with the Society of St. Pius X, the Pontifical Commission "Ecclesia Dei" cannot recommend that members of the faithful frequent their chapels for the reasons which we have outlined above. We deeply regret this situation and pray that soon a reconciliation of the Society of St. Pius X with the Church may come about, but until such time the explanations which we have given remain in force.

If the SSPX is not in schism now because of the lifting of the excommunications, then it would logically follow that they were in schism before the excommunications were lifted. But Ferrara can't bring himself to state either proposition clearly. Instead he argues that

> in justice the Society and its one million adherents must now be seen by everyone as a bona fide "ecclesial movement" within the Catholic Church, with any remaining issues being precisions of canonical regularity to be resolved by further decrees.

Ferrara can't have it both ways. By claiming that the SSPX was not in an irregular situation before the lifting of the excommunications, he nullifies the point which the lifting of the excommunications made. But if what he says about schism is true, why did he add the word "now" to the previous passage? If there were no problems, why were there excommunications? If there was no lifting of the excommunications, why is Ferrara rejoicing?

THE BRUNT

Ferrara focuses the brunt of his attack on Bishop Williamson and accuses him of being a Holocaust denier. In canonical terms this is known as straining at the gnat but swallowing the camel. Ferrara can't seem to distinguish between schism, which is a grave sin according to the authentic teaching of the Church, and discussions of how many people died in World War II and how they died, which, no matter how inane or unfounded these views might be, do not rise to the level of excommunicable offense, not in the Catholic Church at least. To have his excommunication lifted, Bishop Fellay had to make "the commitment to avoid every public intervention which does not respect the person of the Holy Father and which may be negative to ecclesial charity."

This phrase may have given Ferrara pause, but if so, not for long because Ferrara goes on to excuse his own attacks on the "conciliar popes" as

> in keeping with the due liberty of the members of the Mystical Body, and indeed their duty to speak out when they believe in conscience that the common good of the Church is being harmed, even should that harm involve acts or omissions of the Supreme Pontiff himself.

Ferrara then imposes the canons of political correctness on any traditionalist who doubts the conventional narrative of World War II. In fact, he continues,

> It is time, then, for traditionalists to repudiate the inadmissible opinions of Bishop Richard Williamson, with due respect for his dignity as a descendant of the Apostles. For the good of the Church we must make it clear that the Bishop's opinions are not those of the worldwide "traditionalist movement" (if we must call it that). Above all, we must not allow the Society or the movement as a whole to be draped with the albatross of the Bishop's opinion on how many Jews perished at the hands of the Nazis.

Traditionalism, as espoused by Ferrara, is the Catholic world turned upside down. In this world it's acceptable to be a schism denier, but when it comes to thought crimes like "Holocaust denial," traditionalists of the Ferrara stripe are far less tolerant. This is precisely the attitude Msgr. Perl warned against when he wrote that "over a period of time . . . one slowly imbibes a schismatic mentality which separates itself from the teaching of the Supreme Pontiff and the entire Catholic Church." Traditionalists, in other words, can engage in all of the attacks on the papacy which Bishop Fellay had to abjure in order to have the excommunications lifted, as long as they toe the line on political correctness:

> Therefore, not only this newspaper [*The Remnant*], but every journal of traditional Catholic opinion, and above all the Society itself, must clearly and unequivocally declare – as I do here and now – that Holocaust revisionism, wacky conspiracy theories, and other such nonsense will have no part in the traditionalist movement.

Ferrara's formulation of the issue is deeply schismatic in its orientation. Who cares about the so-called "traditionalist movement" or what its self-appointed leaders teach, or who they want to exclude from their "movement"? By defining themselves as a "movement," the traditionalists have separated themselves from the Church. The real issue is what the Catholic Church teaches, not what needs to be done to police "the movement."

Now that Ferrara has brought up the term in a theological context, what exactly is Holocaust revisionism? Do Catholics now have to accept Hitler's diaries as authentic? What about the stories of lampshades made out of the skin of Jewish concentration camp inmates? What about the flaming pits which gave the name to the Holocaust? What about the electrocution and

head-bashing machines? What about the touching story of the all-Negro 761st tank battalion which liberated the Jewish inmates of Buchenwald, as depicted on the PBS documentary "Liberators"? Was that part of the Holocaust narrative? If so, it was exposed as a hoax by Jeffrey Goldberg and others in the *New York Times*, which had previously given serious, if naïve, coverage to this story. What about the equally touching story of love in the concentration camps that was recounted on Oprah and exposed as a hoax the week before *l'affaire Williamson* broke? Professor David O'Connell was accused of going to "the brink of Holocaust Denial" by none other than thought cop Deborah Lipstadt for writing an article in *Culture Wars* about the inconsistencies in Elie Wiesel's Golocaust narrative *Night*. Who knew that literary criticism could land you in jail?

Ferrara loses sight of the big issue in his rush to turn Bishop Williamson over to the thought police. The big issue at the heart of the Williamson affair is religious. It has to do with which religion is true: Christianity or what Rabbi Jacob Neusner referred to as "the Judaism of Holocaust and Redemption." Elie Wiesel made the situation clear in 1971 when he claimed that "The sincere Christian knows that what died in Auschwitz was not the Jewish people but Christianity." *L'affaire Williamson* was an attempt by the world's Jewish organizations to force the pope to accept their dogmas as normative for Catholics. It was an attempt to force Christians to accept what St. Paul in Titus 1:14 refers to as "Jewish fables" as superior to Christian dogmas. This is not to deny the reality of Jewish suffering during World War II. This admission, however, must be joined to a similar concession, namely, that no one can define the boundaries of the Holocaust narrative. Must Catholics accept parts of the Holocaust narrative which everyone now admits never happened? St. Paul tells us that there are "a great many people . . . who talk nonsense and try to make others believe it, particularly among those of the Circumcision." Instead of telling us to go along with these liars "who ruin whole families by teaching things which they ought not to, and doing it with the vile motive of making money," Paul tells Titus to "stop taking notice of Jewish myths." It's a message that Christopher Ferrara would do well to take to heart rather than demand that Bishop Williamson give his assent to a narrative full of "Jewish fables," many of which have gone down the memory hole over the past half century. Lest anyone think I am exaggerating, we should remember that the ADL denounced Norman Finkelstein as a Holocaust denier (he never doubted the existence of gas chambers or that millions of Jews were systematically killed) and that Alan Dershowitz has gone as far as to say that the leading expert on the Holocaust, Raul Hilberg, is to be found on the spectrum of Holocaust Denial because of his support of Finkelstein!

AN APOLOGY

Bishop Williamson issued an apology on January 28, 2009. In it he claimed he was responsible for a "tremendous media storm stirred up by imprudent remarks of mine on Swedish television." Citing Jonas 1:12, Williamson suggested that the pope "Take me up and throw me into the sea; then the sea will quiet down for you; for I know it is because of me that this great tempest has come upon you."

Although Pope Benedict and Cardinal Castrillon Hoyos would have been happy to grant Bishop Williamson his wish, it wouldn't have helped. This storm was not of Bishop Williamson's making. Williamson's actions were indisputably "imprudent," as he himself admitted, but God was using them to bring about a long-overdue clarification of the Church's current position on the Jews, a position which can be traced back to the Vatican II document *Nostra Aetate* and is now codified in the *The Catechism of the Catholic Church,* which claims that "The Church remains faithful to the interpretation of 'all the Scriptures'" concerning the crucifixion and death of Our Lord Jesus Christ. The *Catechism* tells us that "The personal sin of the participants (Judas, the Sanhedrin, Pilate) is known to God alone. . . . Hence, we cannot lay responsibility for the trial on the Jews in Jerusalem as a whole, despite the outcry of a manipulated crowd and the global reproaches contained in the apostles' calls to conversion after Pentecost." The *Catechism* ignores the distinction between the Jewish minority, who were ignorant and manipulated, and the majority, who hated Jesus and wanted him dead. The Scipture passages which the *Catechism* dismisses as "global reproaches" invariably insist on the guilt of the Jews not their ignorance. The difference is largely one of time. The more that time passed, the more convinced the Apostles became of Jewish guilt for rejecting Christ. *Nostra Aetate* tends to rely on Acts 3:17 and ignores I Thess 2: 14-15 as one of those "global reproaches." In that passage St. Paul addresses the community in Thessalonika as: "You, my brothers," who have been "suffering the same treatment from your own countrymen as they have suffered from the Jews, the people who put the Lord Jesus to death, and the prophets too. And now they have been persecuting us, and acting in a way that cannot please God and makes them the enemies of the whole human race. . . ."

The *Catechism* proposes *Nostra Aetate* ("Neither all Jews indiscriminately at that time, nor Jews today, can be charged with the crimes committed during his Passion . . . . The Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from Holy Scripture.") as the lens through which we must now interpret I Thess 2: 14-15.

As Bishop Fellay's comments on the lifting of the excommunications indicated, this move involves a total inversion of the hermeneutic of the Church. The world has been turned upside down. The same Church which

traditionally specified that every council document should be read in the light of tradition is now saying that tradition should now be viewed in the light of a project ("the spirit of Vatican II" if you will) which turns the interpretations of one council into a meta-Magisterium.

The point of the *Catechism*'s section on the Jews is not only to cast doubt on the literal meaning of passages like IThess 2: 14-16 and a host of other passages, but also to exonerate the Jews from any responsibility for the passion and death of Christ. The main way the *Catechism* does this is by insisting then that "sinners were the authors and the ministers of all the sufferings that the divine Redeemer endured" and that "our crime in this case is greater in us than in the Jews."

This may be an indictment of sinful Christians, but it is hardly an exoneration of the Jews, even though it is portrayed in that light. No matter what Abe Foxman says, the terms "Jews" and "sinners" are not mutually exclusive categories. In fact, the rejection of Jesus Christ and the collaboration in his murder makes all of the Jews involved in that conspiracy sinners. This indictment, of course, does not extend to the Jewish race as a whole, i.e., to people like the Blessed Mother, the beloved disciple, the Apostles, St. Paul, etc.: hence, the Church's ongoing and constant condemnation of anti-semitism, which is totally irrational from a Christian perspective because it condemns the race which produced Jesus Christ.

However, it does mean that every Jew who called for Christ's death and asked that "his blood be on us and our children," as well as every Jew since that time who has rejected Jesus Christ shares responsibility for his death because of their participation in the sin of rejecting him. Paul addresses this on-going rejection of Logos when he says that the Jews "never stop trying to finish off the sins they have begun." As a result, "retribution is overtaking them at last." So *Nostra Aetate* is correct when it claims that Scripture proposes no "curse." The "retribution" which Paul describes comes about as a result not of some curse placed on the Jews; no, on the contrary, it flows naturally from their rejection of Logos.

But let's leave the accusation Paul levels against the Jews as "the people who put the Lord Jesus to death" aside for a moment. What about his claim that the Jews are "the enemies of the whole human race"? The *Catechism*, citing Vatican II, tells us that "The Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from Holy Scripture." How are we then to reconcile these two statements? Once again the postconciliar Church is confronted with a hermeneutical issue of its own making. Do we interpret the Spirit of Vatican II in the light of tradition or do we interpret tradition in light of the Spirit of Vatican II?

By January 29, this issue lay at the heart of the conflict and it was going to reassert itself willy nilly even after Bishop Fellay silenced Bishop Williamson, because the repressed, as Sigmund Freud taught, always returns.

Shortly after Fellay and Schmidberger apologized for Williamson's remarks, an SSPX priest from northern Italy re-ignited the controversy by coming to Williamson's defense. Father Floriano Abrahamowicz, a priest from the northern Italian branch of the SSPX, came to Williamson's defense, claiming that he didn't know if Jews had been gassed either. He did say that Williamson had been "imprudent" to allow himself to be drawn into the topic. But, even so, Williamson, according to Abrahamowicz, did not deny that the Holocaust had happened; his doubts had to do with the "technical aspects of the gas chambers." No one was obligated to hold particular views about the English-American genocide which took place during the bombing of Dresden, Abrahamowicz opined. Why then was Auschwitz so special? Would Williamson be in trouble if he claimed that "only" 3,000 Germans died during the fire bombing of Dresden?

The Abrahamowicz story took a turn toward the heart of the matter when the priest, whose father is Jewish, claimed that he wanted the Jews to convert to Catholicism. "As a Catholic Christian," Abrahamowicz told the *Tribuna di Treviso*, a newspaper from the southern Tirol, "I wish that the Jews would receive Jesus Christ as their Lord. Amen."[5] On February 6, Father Abrahamowicz was expelled from the SSPX for sedevacantism and statements disrespectful of the pope.

Shortly before Abrahamowicz was expelled, SSPX priest Father Pierpaulo Petrucci, prior of Rimini, defended Williamson and Abrahamowicz, and in doing so got still closer to the heart of the matter, which had to do with the disruptive effect that *Nostra Aetate* and the Church's "improved" relations with the Jews had on evangelization: "The Church," Petrucci said, "has gotten away from bringing up the truth as a way of bringing about conversion. The Church engages in dialogue, but no one preaches conversion."

Much was made of the fact that the Jewish Council in Germany as well as the Israeli Rabbinate broke off relations with the Vatican after the pope lifted the excommunications. Almost no one noticed that a week before *l'affaire Williamson* happened, the Italian rabbis broke their relations with the pope because of the changes he had made in the Good Friday prayer a year before. That fact, hardly noted in the ensuing furor, lent credence to both Abrahamowicz and Petrucci's analysis of what was really going on. If 50 years of dialogue could end this abruptly, one has to wonder what was achieved. Was there a relationship to begin with? Or had dialogue become a pretext for something else? Had it become what David O'Connell claimed when he wrote in *Culture Wars* that "In the 40 years since Vatican II, this alleged 'dialogue' has actually turned out to be a one way street in which the Jewish side ritually denounces Catholics and Catholicism while the Catholics nod in approval." Reacting to the rabbis' announcement, Vatican spokesman Federico Lombardi hoped that the dialogue would return to its formerly "serene" state, but there seemed little hope of that.

Before long, however, Rome began to crumble under the pressure. Instead of just letting the dogs bark as the caravan passed by, the Vatican began issuing statements which made Professor Foa's comments seem judicious by comparison. By the end of the week, Father Lombardi was beginning to sound like Elie Wiesel. "He who negates the Shoah, denies God!" was the headline Suedtirol.online put over Lombardi's theological lucubrations.[6]

According to John Allen, it was the Abrahamowicz interview which "prompted the Vatican Spokesman, Jesuit Fr. Lombardi to go on Vatican Radio to say that 'he who denies the fact of the Shoah knows nothing of the mystery of God nor of the cross of Christ.'" Holocaust denial is "even more serious," Lombardi said, when it "comes from the mouth of a priest or bishop, meaning a Christian minister, whether or not he's in union with the Catholic Church."

"What recent events make clear," Allen continued,

> is that there are two camps in the small universe that rotates around the Society of St. Pius X. The first, represented by Fellay, is composed of traditionalists whose concerns are solely liturgical and doctrinal, and who see the future of their movement as a leaven within the formal structures of the church; the second, represented by Williamson and Abrahamowicz, includes people for whom theological traditionalism bleeds off into far-right politics, xenophobia, and conspiracy theories.

Evidently Cardinal Dario Castrillon Hoyos didn't know about either camp. "We absolutely didn't know anything about this Williamson. I really think that no one was aware of it," Cardinal Dario Castrillon Hoyos was quoted as saying in an interview published in *Corriere della Sera*.

Allen found that implausible: "Claims that the Vatican was caught off-guard don't cut it; well before Williamson appeared on Swedish TV, he had a public record of Holocaust denial and antagonism toward Jews which a 30-second Google search would have unearthed"[7]

> In 1989, for example, police in Canada briefly considered filing charges against Williamson under that country's hate speech laws after he gave an address in Quebec charging that Jews were responsible for "changes and corruption" in the Catholic Church, that "not one Jew" perished in Nazi gas chambers, and that the Holocaust was a myth created so that the West would "approve the state of Israel."[8]

Allen then muddied the theological waters by citing passages from the SSPX website which indicated, in his view, that "The historical association between some strains of traditionalist Catholicism and anti-Semitism run deep." Those strains include the fact that "Traditionalists often uphold a robust missionary theology, insisting that the church cannot renounce its duty to evangelize any group, including Jews." Those strains also include the fact that, "The SSPX . . . issued a statement asserting that 'a Catholic cannot be anti-Semitic without

destroying the origin and essence of his own faith.'" An unbiased observer might conclude that statements like that would exonerate the SSPX from the charge of anti-Semitism, but Allen hints that the statement is mere window dressing to cover over "a track record in some traditionalist and Lefebvrite circles of open hostility toward Jews and Judaism that is anything but latent." For example, "In just the past year, controversy arose in Germany when a priest of the fraternity asserted that Jews were 'coresponsible' for the death of Christ." Did he cite 1Thess 2:15, perhaps?

Missing from Allen's account was a clear distinction between anti-Semitism, which is wrong, and the anti-Jewish polemic which is part of the fabric of the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul and virtually every Father of the Church and an inextricable part of the Catholic faith. *L'affaire Williamson* presented a golden opportunity to make this distinction, but no one, not the pope, not the Vatican, not the traditionalists, not the pundits, seemed willing or capable of making it. Allen to his credit did say that "if it is not arrested, a schism can become self-replicating and produce a parallel church." The schism had hurt all involved. It prevented the purification of the traditionalism which the SSPX was promoting, but it also put the Church the Lefebvrites had left behind into the unnatural position of denying its own tradition in the name of Vatican II.

Allen's report on the murky underside of the SSPX was only the tip of the iceberg. If the Jews were interested in damaging evidence against the SSPX they should have consulted *Fidelity* magazine, in particular Thomas W. Case's article, "The Society of St. Pius X Gets Sick," in the October 1992 issue, p. 28, or "In the Line of Fire: John Rizzo, Ex-SSPX" by Michael Mazza, *Fidelity*, May 1995, or a series of articles on the SSPX and schism by John Beaumont. Of course, if the Southern Poverty Law Center had done this, it would have undermined their case against me as a Nazi. Nevertheless, in Case's article, they would have read that

> In 1989 Williamson delivered some speeches in Canada that caused some consternation and got him investigated for possible "hate crimes" by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police. In Sherbrooke, Quebec, he said "there was not one Jew killed in the gas chambers. It was all lies, lies, lies. The Jews created the Holocaust so we would prostrate ourselves on our knees before them and approve the new State of Israel . . . Jews made up the Holocaust. Protestants get their orders from the devil, and the Vatican sold its soul to liberalism."

The Williamson story, in other words, has been out for 20 years and was reported on 17 years ago in *Culture Wars*' predecessor *Fidelity*. Tom Case's article makes clear that Bishop Williamson was far from the most extreme member of the SSPX:

> Father Ramon Angles (rector of the Pius X academy and the college in St. Mary's Kansas) has an apartment full of Nazi paraphernalia, which he shows to favored boys. He shows them the Nazi ceremonial daggers worn by officers of the Third Reich. He is proud of the vintage Mercedes owned by his family which was owned by Adolf Hitler. A one-time student at the academy was favored by a special meeting with Father Angles a couple of years ago. In his private room on campus, Angles treated him and a friend to a pizza and a showing of the Nazi propaganda film *Triumph of the Will.*
>
> He played the film back, stopping it in places commenting with fervor and reading back from the stack of Hitler speech transcripts he had at his side. Leni Riefenstahl, the film's producer and a chief propagandist for the Third Reich is still alive and resides in South America. Father Angles visits her often (he informs the students) and boasts of the association.

Case also recounted the case of Father Gregory Post, the first American priest ordained into the SSPX, who

> arrived at the San Jose, California airport dressed in the full regalia of an SS army officer, complete with helmet, boots and swastika arm bands. San Jose Pius X members who picked him up at the airport were indignant, and the then district superior of the society had to fly out to San Jose to reprimand the priest and cool off the situation.

This and other anecdotes led Case to conclude that "There is a virulent sickness of hatred and Hitlerism running through the traditional Catholic movement."

Lest anyone think that personal animus was the driving force behind the Case article, *Fidelity* ran a follow up piece three years later "In the Line of Fire: John Rizzo, Ex-SSPX" (*Fidelity*, May 1995), in which Michael Mazza recounts a conversation that former SSPX priest Father Rizzo had with Ramon Angles:

> All of a sudden, without any provocation whatsoever, he got up and went over to his bookshelf. He pulled out this huge book with the title *The Life of Adolf Hitler* and a big picture of Hitler on the cover giving his salute. He put it on the bridge of his nose, the same way the sub-deacon holds up the Book of the Gospels at a solemn High mass. He walked around the coffee table in his apartment, making the noise of a thurible ("ching ching ching ching"). After he sat down he says, "Well, Rizzo, what do you think of that? Isn't this great?" He was laughing quite devilishly. He then asked, "What else do you want to talk about?"

When told about Ramon's antics, "Father Peter Scott . . . reportedly responded: "What can I do? I'm afraid of Father Angles." Father Rizzo had similar experiences when he decided to leave the SSPX. On the advice of the legal authorities, Rizzo began wearing a bulletproof vest.

A little over a year after Mazza's article castigating the SSPX appeared in *Fidelity*, the editor of that magazine got a phone call from a man with a British accent. It was Bishop Williamson and he was calling me not to tell me to wear a bullet-proof vest but to congratulate me on my book *Monsters from the Id*. I was dumbfounded. After 30 years of logomachy I can count calls like this on the fingers of one hand.

That conversation led to Bishop Williamson staying at our house not once but twice. During those stays he had dinner with the Jones family a number of times, and he made a favorable impression on all of us. After his visit, there was a standing joke in the Jones family: "What's the difference between a bishop who has been excommunicated and a bishop in good standing with the Church?"

Answer: "Excommunicated bishops don't hold grudges."

Bishop Williamson's visit then led to an invitation which he extended to me to speak on horror films at the SSPX seminary in Winona. My visit to Winona and the conversations we had there only confirmed my first impression. Williamson was a man of intelligence—his analysis of Beethoven's Fifth Symphony, illustrated by performing excerpts on the piano, is one of the best pieces of musical criticism I ever heard or read—and wit. During the preparations for the talk, Bishop Williamson and I had to vet the film clips I assembled to illustrate my point. "No R rated films," he said, "*Fidelity* might do an expose on us if they found out."

During the question period after my talk, one of the seminarians asked me whether there were similarities between the monsters and the Novus Ordo Mass. When I answered in the negative, he blurted out, "Well, aren't you a traditionalist?

"No," I answered.

"Well, then what are you doing here?"

The answer to that question was Bishop Williamson, a man who possesses both intelligence and magnanimity, a rare combination in any man these days, and even rarer in a bishop.

There is another answer to that question, and that answer is Christianity. Unlike Jews who are often exhorted never to forget and never to forgive, Christians are taught to do both. Hate, we all learned by reading *First Things*, is a Jewish virtue. The fact that I published what I did about the SSPX and Williamson and that it did not lead to hatred is a tribute to Bishop Williamson as a man but also to the religion we both share, a religion which demands both fraternal correction and forgiveness. That is what *l'affaire Williamson* is all about. It's about whether, as Yuri Slezkine claims in *The Jewish Century*, we have all become Jews.

Tom Case said that the main reason Lefebvre's May 1988 agreement with the Church fell through was the question of the bishops. Lefebvre, Case wrote,

> had presented the names of potential bishops and Rome had demurred. The selection of bishops is a touchy subject. With papal approval, it is perfectly legitimate. Without papal approval, it is a schismatic act and an excommunicable offense. . . . The real problem of the bishops, in this instance, was not when, but who? . . . Rome had an extensive dossier on the men favored for consecration. And that is why the pope reserves to himself the right of approval, and why it is such a grave act to consecrate a bishop without it. It is not a technical matter, but a measure to protect the Faith. How could Rome ever approve a bishop who really believed that the pope was a tool of the Freemasons?

Richard Williamson, according to Case, was the candidate who caused the most consternation in Rome. And it was Williamson, according to Case, who persuaded Lefebvre to renege on his agreement when he returned from Rome after signing the May 5 accord. "There were too many in the Society (meaning Williamson and company) who simply had no trust in Rome at all. Under that pressure, the Archbishop changed his mind." One of the things Rome found most objectionable was Williamson's views on the Jews. In a Letter from Winona, dated February 1, 1991, Williamson wrote that "Until [the Jews] discover their true Messianic vocation [by conversion to Christ], they may be expected to continue fanatical agitation in accordance with their false messianic vocation of Jewish world-dominion, to prepare the Anti-Christ's throne in Jerusalem . . . the wise Catholic will remember that, again, the ex-Christian nations have only their own Liberalism to blame for allowing the free circulation within Christendom to the enemies of Christ. . . ."

It was hard not to see God's hand in this. Or was it the return of the repressed? Rome would have never approved Williamson as a bishop, but the fact that he ended up a bishop anyway may have been God's way of saying that some divine intervention was needed to solve the problems Rome had shown itself incapable or unwilling to resolve, in particular questions involving the Church's relations with the Jews. The Lefebvrite schism has hurt both parties. The harm to the SSPX should be obvious by now. But the Church was harmed as well by becoming a *de facto* bastion of anti-Tradition, especially on the question of the Jews. If God was trying to teach the Church a lesson in the Williamson affair, the Church was showing reluctance to learn even in the expensive school of experience. Rome seemed determined to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory as the agonizing of the first few days led to a phase of second guessing and buck passing. One report had Cardinal Re in a bus full of bishops heading to a liturgical celebration at Santa Maria Maggiore mocking Cardinal Castrillon-Hoyos as a hopeless buffoon for his mishandling of the excomunications. *The New York Times*[9] portrayed Cardinal Walter Kasper, the director of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity and the liaison for Vatican-Jewish relations, as distancing himself from a debacle that was not of his making. Kasper claimed that he had not been consulted. "It

was a decision of the pope," the cardinal said in a telephone interview. A few days later, Kasper was quoted as complaining about "management mistakes" and "lack of communication in the Vatican."

Less invidious, but along the same lines, was a John Allen article which lectured the Vatican on Public Relations 101. Allen called the handling of the lifting of the excommunications "a colossal blunder" and "stunningly inept." Allen claimed that "The Vatican under Benedict XVI still has not learned the lessons of Regensburg."

Well, maybe so, but Allen never tells us just what the lessons of Regensburg were. Was it that the media can create incidents to embarrass the pope and the church? Was it that the media can stir up lynch mobs in both Germany and Islamic countries? Or were there deeper lessons involved in the Williamson affair which John Allen still hasn't learned, as, for example, the lesson which the Catholic Catechism (para 581) drew from pondering Jesus's relation to the Jews: "Jesus could not help but offend the teachers of the Law for he was not content to propose his interpretation along side theirs, but taught the people 'as one who had authority, and not as their scribes.'"

The lesson the Catechism proposed applied to both Christ and Christ's vicar on earth, the pope. Jesus knew intuitively that public relations was not going to save him from suffering in his dealings with the Jews. His followers had to learn this lesson the hard way. The real lesson of Regensburg was that the Jewish-controlled media will use any pretext to stir up animosity against the pope and discord within the Catholic Church? Better public relations techniques, Allen seems to be claiming, could have avoided this debacle. But is that true?

The pope was no stranger to the theological version of public relations. Cardinal Ratzinger tried to finesse the Jewish question (i.e., how good relations with the Jews squares with the Gospel admonition to work for their conversion) years before he became pope. In *Reconciling Gospel and Torah: the Catechism*, Cardinal Ratzinger wrote that

> The history of the relationship between Israel and Christendom is drenched with blood and tears. It is a history of mistrust and hostility, but also, thank God, a history marked again and again by attempts at forgiveness, understanding and mutual acceptance. After Auschwitz, the mission of reconciliation and acceptance permits no deferral. Does this hostility result from something in the very faith of Christians? Is it something in the "essence of Christianity," such that one would have to prescind from Christianity's core, deny Christianity its heart, in order to come to real reconciliation? This is an assumption that some Christian thinkers have in fact made in the last few decades in reaction to the horrors of history. Do confession of Jesus of Nazareth as the Son of the living God and faith in the cross as the redemption of mankind contain an implicit condemnation of the Jews as stubborn and blind, as guilty

> of the death of the Son of God? Could it be that the core of the faith of Christians themselves compels them to intolerance, even to hostility toward the Jews, and conversely, that the self-esteem of Jews and the defense of their historic dignity and deepest convictions oblige them to demand that Christians abandon the heart of their faith and so require Jews similarly to forsake tolerance? Is the conflict programmed in the heart of religion and only to be overcome by its repudiation?

Cardinal Ratzinger is looking into the wrong end of the telescope. The hostility doesn't result "from something in the very faith of Christians." It is the inexorable result of the Jewish rejection of Logos. But, conceding that, "the question remains: Can Christian faith, left in its inner power and dignity, not only tolerate Judaism but accept it in its historic mission? Or can it not? Can there be true reconciliation without abandoning the faith, or is reconciliation tied to such abandonment?"

THE RIGHT QUESTIONS

Ratzinger is acute in his ability to formulate the right questions. But he seems determined to avoid the obvious answers which Scripture and Tradition have always given to these questions. As of the death of Christ, Judaism had no historical mission because, as of the destruction of the Temple, Judaism, as understood by Moses, ceased to exist. This is not to say that the Jewish people will play no distinctive role in the end times. Rather than go directly to Scripture, Ratzinger turns to the Catechism to maximize the claims he plans to make because, as he puts it: "This work has been published by the magisterium of the Catholic Church as an authentic expression of her faith. In recognition of the significance of Auschwitz and from the mission of the Second Vatican Council, the matter of reconciliation has been inscribed in the catechism as an object of faith."

Unfortunately, the passages he cites have to do with the moral law and not the Jews. As a result they can't answer the questions he raises. Ratzinger says that:

> The mission of Jesus consists in leading the histories of the nations into the community of the history of Abraham, in the history of Israel. His mission is unification, reconciliation, as the Letter to the Ephesians (2:18-22) will then present it. The history of Israel should become the history of all, Abraham's sonship become extended to the 'many.'
>
> Conversely, this means that all nations, without the abolishment of the special mission of Israel, become brothers and receivers of the promises of the chosen people, they become people of God with Israel through adherence to the will of God and through acceptance of the Davidic Kingdom.

This is true but it does not deal with the fundamental issue, namely the Jewish hostility to Christ and their ongoing rejection of Logos. Ratzinger's text is littered with statements that are undeniably true, but something prevents him from uniting these statements into a coherent thesis:

> Old and New Testaments, Jesus and the Sacred Scripture of Israel, appear here as indivisible. . . . Reconciliation in the common recognition of the kingdom of God . . . One understands nothing about him if one does not enter with him into the dynamic of reconciliation. . . . He was "to fulfill the law . . ." With these statements we find ourselves at the center of the Christian-Jewish dialogue, we reach the juncture where we are faced with the decisive choice between reconciliation and alienation. . . . Beyond all historic and strictly theological discussions, we find ourselves placed in the middle of the question of the present responsibility of Jews and Christians before the modern world. This responsibility consists precisely in representing the truth of the one will of God before the world and thus placing man before this inner truth, which is at the same time his way. Jews and Christians must bear witness to the one God, to the Creator of Heaven and Earth and do this in that entirety which Psalm 19 formulates in an exemplary way.

Then, as if to say that he hasn't convinced himself, Ratzinger comes back to the same nagging question: "Does such a view of the relationship between the law and the Gospel not come down to an unacceptable attempt at harmonization?" Ratzinger seems haunted by the fact that the answer to that question, in spite of the project of Vatican II, seems to be 'yes.' The more scriptural evidence he brings us (and he doesn't bring up much) the more he undermines his own argument:

> How does one explain then the conflict which led to Jesus's cross? Does all of this not stand in contradiction to St. Paul's interpretation of the figure of Jesus? Are we not denying here the entire Pauline doctrine of grace in favor of a new moralism, thereby abolishing . . . the essential innovation of Christianity? . . . Reconciliation and separation appear thus to be tied up in a virtually insolvable paradox.
>
> In the catechism's theology of the New Testament, the cross cannot simply be viewed as an accident which actually could have been avoided nor as the sin of Israel with which Israel becomes eternally stained in contrast to the pagans for whom the cross signifies redemption. In the New Testament there are not two effects of the cross: a damning one and a saving one, but only a single effect, which is saving and reconciling.

Instead of seeing the cross as proof that reconciliation on human terms is impossible and conflict with the Jews is unavoidable, Ratzinger switches horses in mid-stream and appeals to the Catechism as a *deus ex machina* that

gets him out of trouble and lends an aura of infallibility by bringing up issues that are beside the point, namely,

> "Jews are not collectively responsible for Jesus's death" The catechism recalls that esteemed Jewish personages were followers of Jesus according to the witness of the Gospels, that according to St. John, shortly before Jesus's death "many even of the authorities believed in him" (Jn 12:42). . . . St. James is also mentioned, who commented, "How many thousands there are among the Jews of those who have believed; they are all zealous for the law" (Acts 21:20). Thus it is elucidated that the report of Jesus's trial cannot substantiate a charge of collective Jewish guilt. The Second Vatican Council is expressly cited: "Neither all Jews indiscriminately at that time, nor Jews today, can be charged with the crimes committed during his passion . . . The Jews should not be spoken of as rejected or accursed as if this followed from Holy Scripture. . . . All sinners were the authors of Christ's passion.

PERSONAL NARRATIVE

Ratzinger's narrative then shifts from the infallible to the personal, "Already as a child," he tells us, "I could not understand how some people wanted to derive a condemnation of Jews from the death of Jesus because the following thought had penetrated my soul as something profoundly consoling: Jesus's blood raises no calls for retaliation but calls all to reconciliation."

What Church document calls for retaliation? *Sicut Judaeis non* the official Church teaching on the Jews for the millennium between the time when Pope St. Gregory the Great first formulated it until *Nostra Aetate*, stated specifically, repeatedly and unequivocally, that no one had the right to harm the Jew. *Nostra Aetate* did not repudiate *Sicut Judaeis non*, it simply ignored it and proposed in its stead a number of statements which got turned into an experiment, which was not part of the original text. Ratzinger articulates that the aspiration behind that experiment, which could also be seen as a "hope" or a fantasy, when he writes:

> Jews and Christians should accept each other in profound inner reconciliation, neither in disregard of their faith nor in its denial, but out of the depth of faith itself. In their mutual reconciliation they should become a force for peace in and for the world. Through their witness to the one God, who cannot be adored apart from the unity of love of God and neighbor, they should open the door into the world for this God so that his will be done and so that it become on earth "as it is in heaven," "so that his kingdom come."

Who can disagree with a statement like this? It is indisputably true to say that Jews "should become a force for peace in and for the world," and they

probably would do so, if it were not for their tragic rejection of Logos, a rejection which made them "enemies of the whole human race." "Should" is the key word here. Ratzinger can only promote his vision, the experiment of Vatican II, by ignoring the clear testimony of the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, the Church Fathers, and the teaching of the medieval Church based upon *Sicut Judaeis non* about what kind of people the Jews became when they rejected Christ, the Logos, and how Christians were supposed to deal with them. In the final analysis, Cardinal Ratzinger is giving expression to a personal vision, which no matter how laudable (or naïve) is not a theological reality. Vatican II was a valid council which gave birth to a hope which became a shared fantasy as time went on. Vatican II gave birth to an experiment based on the premise that the Church had nothing to fear from the modern world. That experiment involved accepting certain terms as the world defined them, and one of those terms was "Jew," and another was "anti-Semitism." In the aftermath of Vatican II, the Church appeared to accept the Enlightenment's definition of the Jew, as proposed by thinkers like Lessing in *Nathan der Weise*. There was no theological reality at the foundation of this experiment, and so it was doomed to failure, a failure we are now witnessing as it unfolds in front of us.

The theological reality can be found in Scripture, which ultimately defines the Jew for us as the rejecter of Christ and Logos and, therefore, a follower of Satan, as described in John 8. Or as "enemies of the whole human race," as Paul puts it, or as "the synagogue of Satan." "The Jews," according to St. Paul, are "the people who put the Lord Jesus to death, and the prophets too. And now they have been persecuting us, and acting in a way that cannot please God and makes them the enemies of the whole human race, because they are hindering us from preaching to the pagans and trying to save them. They never stop trying to finish off the sins they have begun, but retribution is overtaking them at last." The note from the New American Bible informs us:

> Paul is speaking of historical opposition on the part of Palestinian Jews in particular and does so only some 20 years after Jesus's crucifixion. Even so, he quickly proceeds to depict the persecutors typologically, in apocalyptic terms. His remarks give no grounds for anti-Semitism to those willing to understand him, especially in view of St. Paul's pride in his own ethnic and religious background.

We concur. The conclusion derived from St. Paul's epistle to the Thessalonians is inescapable. A Christian cannot be anti-Semitic, but a Christian must be anti-Jewish. Christians who attempt to minimalize the anti-Jewish nature of the Catholic Faith invariably end up denying both the Gospel and Tradition. The most basic fact of Jewish-Christian dialogue has to be a candid admission that the Catholic Faith is, as Mischa Brumlich put it in 1989, "*judenfeindlich.*" If the Jews want to talk to us after we admit that fact, then maybe Jewish-

Catholic dialogue will have some purpose, but sooner or later the Church is going to have to accept this fact because it is part of the DNA of Christianity and not even a mind as great as that of Pope Benedict XVI can finesse this fundamental conflict.

This is also, of course, the fundamental clarification which the Jews by their constant and indiscriminate use of the term "anti-Semitism" want to obscure. There are over one billion Catholics in the world. And yet as of the third week of the Williamson crisis not one had stepped forward to say that there was a fundamental difference between *Mein Kampf* and the writings of St. Paul, and, more importantly, that the use of the term "anti-Semitism" is not an accurate account of what both Adolf Hitler and St. Paul believed.

To be fair, Cardinal Ratzinger made precisely this point ten years ago when the Church released the document entitled "We Remember: A Reflection on the Shoah" in 1998. As Gustav Niehbuhr wrote in the *New York Times* on March 29, 1998, "We Remember" "bluntly condemns the Nazi genocide and calls the church to repentance on behalf of Catholics who did nothing to stop it. But it also carefully distinguishes between centuries of 'anti-Judaism' as a religious teaching and the Nazis' murderous anti-Semitism which, the document says, had its 'roots outside Christianity.'" A comment like this was crying out to be made during the Williamson affair, but instead of clarifying the issue, the Church relied on "spokesmen" like Matthias Kopp, as the mouthpiece of the German bishops, and allowed them to muddy the waters by claiming that the Church must fight "every form of anti-Semitism" without even a remote attempt to define the term. Sooner or later the Church is going to have to make the distinction between being anti-Semitic which is wrong, sinful, and stupid, and being anti-Jewish, which, correctly understood, is a virtue for Christians. It looks as if the only way that this is going to happen is for God to drag the Church kicking and screaming to where it does not want to go, through incidents like the Williamson affair.

Failure to distinguish between anti-Semitism and anti-Judaism continued to drive the crisis by allowing discourse to revolve around an undefined term. As we have come to expect in circumstances like this, two officious rabbis stepped forward and offered the pope unbidden advice on "What the Pope should do to Reassure the World," (*Washington Post*, Jan. 30, 2009). Abraham Cooper and Yitzchok Adlerstein insist that the pope inform the SSPX that "that there is no turning back the clock on the teachings of Vatican II," which is to say, on their interpretation of Vatican II, as removing "the effects of hundreds of years of Church-inspired anti-Semitism and persecution." Vatican II, according to the rabbis, "also helped bring Catholicism firmly into an age of modernity," and that "allowed hundreds of millions of Catholics to escape the tension between modernity and sincere religious belief." These Catholics, the rabbis tell us, "do not want to see a return to the medieval abbey."

It's touching to hear that Rabbis Cooper and Adlerstein want to promote Church teaching, but by now, 50 years after *Nostra Aetate*, Jewish zeal for Catholic teaching raises skepticism about ulterior motives and suspicions that their zeal is more bound up with the Jews' insatiable desire to control discourse than any desire to promote the Catholic Faith. What the rabbis really want is control of the Catholic Church, through control of the categories of ecclesial discourse. The healing of the schism was a threat to this status quo.

Sandro Magister, ("No more excommunication for the Lefebvrists. But Peace is still far off, *Chiesa* online) supported the same status quo from inside the Catholic Church. According to Magister, "The fundamental reason behind the uproar is the anti-Jewish theology that generally distinguishes the Lefebvrists. According to many Jews, the Catholic Church does too little to oppose this anti-Judaism and demand that its supporters recant." Once the argument gets framed in terms of "anti-Judaism," the next question becomes, "Is the Church anti-Jewish?" That question can be answered by reading the Scriptures and Vatican II and interpreting the latter in terms of the former, which seems to be the *modus operandi* of the pope, who according to Magister, told the Roman Curia on December 22, 2005, that "Vatican II did not mark any rupture with the tradition of the Church, but was in continuity with this even where it seemed to mark a clear break with the past. . . ."

The SSPX is right. There is a crisis. Unfortunately, Bishop Fellay is reluctant to say where the most glaring break with tradition has occurred, namely, on the question of the Church's relation to the Jews.

The crisis manifests itself by a debilitating lack of clarity, as when Magister writes:

> At the Angelus on Saturday, January 25, Benedict spoke boldly about the "conversion" of Paul, a Jew. He even said that for Paul, the term "conversion" is improper, "because he was already a believer in fact a fervent Jew, nor did he have to abandon the Jewish faith in order to adhere to Christ."

The rabbis from Los Angeles were moderate in comparison to other Jewish leaders. Alan Dershowitz entered the Williamson affair when he accused Cardinal Martino of anti-Semitism for saying that Gaza "resembles a big concentration camp." Dershowitz, like the rabbis, is an expert on canon law, an expertise he exhibits in the following train of syllogisms:

> Any comparison between Israel's action in Gaza and those of Nazis during the Holocaust is not only obscene, it is blatantly anti-Semitic, which is supposed to be a sin under Vatican law. (It is apparently not, however, a sin for a Catholic bishop to deny that the Holocaust occurred at all, since Bishop Richard Williamson of Great Britain was welcomed back into the Catholic church after claiming that there were no gas chambers and that the Jews are lying when they say that 6 million of them were killed,

> when according to that bigot in robes, a mere 300,000 Jews died during the entire Holocaust).

Dershowitz then invoked the principle of double effect to justify Israeli actions in Gaza:

> An essential aspect of Christian teaching, and especially of Catholic teaching, is the important principle that distinguishes between intentionally killing an innocent person, and unintentionally killing an innocent person in the process of legitimately trying to prevent harm to one's self or others. This concept, known as the principle of double effect, is central to Catholic theology. It traces its roots to Thomas Aquinas and has had enormous influence on moral thinking not only within the Catholic Church, but throughout Christianity and indeed in the secular world as well. Understanding and complying with this principle may literally mean the difference between eternal damnation and eternal salvation. That's how important it is.

Dershowitz's claim to the principle of double effect is based on an even more dubious claim, namely, that Israeli Defense Forces may have "inadvertently" killed "some Palestinian civilians" but only because they were "used as human shields by Hamas."

Dershowitz then lashes out at the Catholic Church, claiming that the pope is "anti-Catholic" because

> The Pope himself has been guilty of invoking such moral equivalence between these very different actions. Indeed it is fair to say that the Vatican's entire approach to the Israel-Hamas conflict has been to suggest a false moral equivalence. . . . Church leaders know better. They understand precisely what they are doing. They are making utilitarian, pragmatic and very anti-Catholic cynical judgments calculated to bolster the influence of The Church in the Middle East. It might be understandable for secular nations to act in so amoral, if not immoral, a manner, but it is entirely unacceptable for the Catholic Church, which eschews utilitarianism and preaches moral consistency and absolutism to act in so cynical a way.
>
> This is especially troubling, because the church tends to forget its own teachings primarily when it deals with the Jewish people and the Jewish state. Its long history of discrimination and bigotry against Jews—slaughtering entire Jewish communities on the way to the Crusades, murdering entire Jewish communities during the inquisitions, fomenting pogroms, and signing a pact with Hitler during the Holocaust—should make it even more concerned about applying a double standard of morality to the Jewish state. But that's exactly what it does. And then it complains when critics point to this obvious double standard.

Dershowitz's comments are a good indication of the fruits of nearly 50 years of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. Just think how intemperate Dershowitz might have been without the benign influence of *Nostra Aetate* guiding him. His comments about the Church "signing a pact with Hitler during the Holocaust," nonetheless, raises interesting historical parallels. It recalls Matthias Kopp's statement about the Vatican's pact with Israel in 1993, the ongoing genocide the Israelis have been waging against the Palestinians, and the Church's very real (if not total) silence in the face of this holocaust. Dershowitz may invoke the principle of double effect as informing the IDF's strategy and claim that the 1300 Palestinians who perished there during the last two weeks of December 2008 died as a result of being used as "human shields" by Hamas, but Noam Chomsky's account of what happened in Gaza tells a different story. According to Chomsky the Saturday December 27 attack on Gaza

> had been meticulously planned, for over 6 months according to the Israeli press. The planning had two components: military and propaganda. It was based on the lessons of Israel's 2006 invasion of Lebanon, which was considered to be poorly planned and badly advertised. We may, therefore, be fairly confident that most of what has been done and said was pre-planned and intended.
>
> That surely includes the timing of the assault: shortly before noon, when children were returning from school and crowds were milling in the streets of densely populated Gaza City. It took only a few minutes to kill over 225 people and wound 700, an auspicious opening to the mass slaughter of defenseless civilians trapped in a tiny cage with nowhere to flee.[10]
>
> In his retrospective "Parsing Gains of Gaza War," *New York Times* correspondent Ethan Bronner cited this achievement as one of the most significant of the gains. Israel calculated that it would be advantageous to appear to "go crazy," causing vastly disproportionate terror, a doctrine that traces back to the 1950s. "The Palestinians in Gaza got the message on the first day," Bronner wrote, "when Israeli warplanes struck numerous targets simultaneously in the middle of a Saturday morning. Some 200 were killed instantly, shocking Hamas and indeed all of Gaza." The tactic of "going crazy" appears to have been successful, Bronner concluded: there are "limited indications that the people of Gaza felt such pain from this war that they will seek to rein in Hamas," the elected government. That is another long-standing doctrine of state terror. I don't, incidentally, recall the *Times* retrospective "Parsing Gains of Chechnya War," though the gains were great.[11]

The meticulous planning also presumably included the termination of the assault, carefully timed to be just before the inauguration, so as to

minimize the (remote) threat that Obama might have to say some words critical of these vicious US-supported crimes.

Two weeks after the Sabbath opening of the assault, with much of Gaza already pounded to rubble and the death toll approaching 1000, the UN Agency UNRWA, on which most Gazans depend for survival, announced that the Israeli military refused to allow aid shipments to Gaza, saying that the crossings were closed for the Sabbath. To honor the holy day, Palestinians at the edge of survival must be denied food and medicine, while hundreds can be slaughtered by US jet bombers and helicopters.

The rigorous observance of the Sabbath in this dual fashion attracted little if any notice. That makes sense. In the annals of US-Israeli criminality, such cruelty and cynicism scarcely merit more than a footnote. They are too familiar. To cite one relevant parallel, in June 1982 the US-backed Israeli invasion of Lebanon opened with the bombing of the Palestinian refugee camps of Sabra and Shatila, later to become famous as the site of terrible massacres supervised by the IDF (Israeli "Defense" Forces). The bombing hit the local hospital – the Gaza hospital – and killed over 200 people, according to the eyewitness account of an American Middle East academic specialist. The massacre was the opening act in an invasion that slaughtered some 15-20,000 people and destroyed much of southern Lebanon and Beirut, proceeding with crucial US military and diplomatic support. That included vetoes of Security Council resolutions seeking to halt the criminal aggression that was undertaken, as was scarcely concealed, to defend Israel from the threat of peaceful political settlement, contrary to many convenient fabrications about Israelis suffering under intense rocketing, a fantasy of apologists.[12]

Norwegian doctor Mads Gilbert, who unlike Alan Dershowitz, was in Gaza when the Israelis attacked:

described the scene of horror as an "All out war against the civilian population of Gaza." He estimated that half the casualties are women and children. The men are almost all civilians as well, by civilized standards. Gilbert reports that he had scarcely seen a military casualty among the 100s of bodies. The IDF concurs. Hamas "made a point of fighting at a distance—or not at all," Ethan Bronner reports while "parsing the gains" of the US-Israeli assault. So Hamas's manpower remains intact, and it was mostly civilians who suffered pain: a positive outcome, according to widely-held doctrine.[13]

These estimates were confirmed by UN humanitarian chief John Holmes, who informed reporters that it is "a fair presumption" that most of the civilians killed were women and children in a humanitarian crisis that is "worsening day by day as the violence continues." But we could be

> comforted by the words of Israeli Foreign Minister Tzipi Livni, the leading dove in the current electoral campaign, who assured the world that there is no "humanitarian crisis" in Gaza, thanks to Israeli benevolence.[14]

Unlike Alan Dershowitz, Israeli officials admit openly that civilians are deliberately targeted. It has always been part of Israel's strategy in dealing with the Palestinians:

> All of this is normal, and quite openly discussed by high Israeli officials. Thirty years ago Chief of Staff Mordechai Gur observed that since 1948, "we have been fighting against a population that lives in villages and cities." As Israel's most prominent military analyst, Zeev Schiff, summarized his remarks, "the Israeli Army has always struck civilian populations, purposely and consciously . . . the Army, he said, has never distinguished civilian [from military] targets . . . [but] purposely attacked civilian targets." The reasons were explained by the distinguished statesman Abba Eban: "there was a rational prospect, ultimately fulfilled, that affected populations would exert pressure for the cessation of hostilities." The effect, as Eban well understood, would be to allow Israel to implement, undisturbed, its programs of illegal expansion and harsh repression. Eban was commenting on a review of Labor government attacks against civilians by Prime Minister Begin, presenting a picture, Eban said, "of an Israel wantonly inflicting every possible measure of death and anguish on civilian populations in a mood reminiscent of regimes which neither Mr. Begin nor I would dare to mention by name." Eban did not contest the facts that Begin reviewed, but criticized him for stating them publicly. Nor did it concern Eban, or his admirers, that his advocacy of massive state terror is also reminiscent of regimes he would not dare to mention by name.[15]

> Eban's justification for state terror is regarded as persuasive by respected authorities. As the current US-Israel assault raged, *Times* columnist Thomas Friedman explained that Israel's tactics both in the current attack and in its invasion of Lebanon in 2006 are based on the sound principle of "trying to 'educate' Hamas, by inflicting a heavy death toll on Hamas militants and heavy pain on the Gaza population." That makes sense on pragmatic grounds, as it did in Lebanon, where "the only long-term source of deterrence was to exact enough pain on the civilians – the families and employers of the militants – to restrain Hezbollah in the future." And by similar logic, bin Laden's effort to "educate" Americans on 9/11 was highly praiseworthy, as were the Nazi attacks on Lidice and Oradour, Putin's destruction of Grozny, and other notable attempts at "education."[16]

Israel has taken pains to make clear its dedication to these guiding principles.

NYT correspondent Stephen Erlanger reports that Israeli human rights groups are "troubled by Israel's strikes on buildings they believe should be classified as civilian, like the parliament, police stations and the presidential palace" – and, we may add, villages, homes, densely populated refugee camps, water and sewage systems, hospitals, schools and universities, mosques, UN relief facilities, ambulances, and indeed anything that might relieve the pain of the unworthy victims. A senior Israeli intelligence officer explained that the IDF attacked "both aspects of Hamas – its resistance or military wing and its dawa, or social wing," the latter a euphemism for the civilian society. "He argued that Hamas was all of a piece," Erlanger continues, "and in a war, its instruments of political and social control were as legitimate a target as its rocket caches." Erlanger and his editors add no comment about the open advocacy, and practice, of massive terrorism targeting civilians, though correspondents and columnists signal their tolerance or even explicit advocacy of war crimes, as noted. But keeping to the norm, Erlanger does not fail to stress that Hamas rocketing is "an obvious violation of the principle of discrimination and fits the classic definition of terrorism."[17]

Like others familiar with the region, Middle East specialist Fawwaz Gerges observes that "What Israeli officials and their American allies do not appreciate is that Hamas is not merely an armed militia but a social movement with a large popular base that is deeply entrenched in society." Hence when they carry out their plans to destroy Hamas's "social wing," they are aiming to destroy Palestinian society.[18]

Gerges may be too kind. It is highly unlikely that Israeli and American officials – or the media and other commentators – do not appreciate these facts. Rather, they implicitly adopt the traditional perspective of those who monopolize means of violence: our mailed fist can crush any opposition, and if our furious assault has a heavy civilian toll, that's all to the good: perhaps the remnants will be properly educated.

IDF officers clearly understand that they are crushing the civilian society. Ethan Bronner quotes an Israeli Colonel who says that he and his men are not much "impressed with the Hamas fighters." "They are villagers with guns," said a gunner on an armored personnel carrier. They resemble the victims of the murderous IDF "iron fist" operations in occupied southern Lebanon in 1985, directed by Shimon Peres, one of the great terrorist commanders of the era of Reagan's "War on Terror." During these operations, Israeli commanders and strategic analysts explained that the victims were "terrorist villagers," difficult to eradicate because "these terrorists operate with the support of most of the local population." An Israeli commander complained that "the terrorist . . . has many eyes here, because he lives here," while the military correspondent of the

> *Jerusalem Post* described the problems Israeli forces faced in combating the "terrorist mercenary," "fanatics, all of whom are sufficiently dedicated to their causes to go on running the risk of being killed while operating against the IDF," which must "maintain order and security" in occupied southern Lebanon despite "the price the inhabitants will have to pay." The problem has been familiar to Americans in South Vietnam, Russians in Afghanistan, Germans in occupied Europe, and other aggressors that find themselves implementing the Gur-Eban-Friedman doctrine.[19]

Norman Finkelstein makes the same point, in a well-documented article:

> The operative plan for the Gaza bloodbath can be gleaned from authoritative statements after the war got underway: "What we have to do is act systematically with the aim of punishing all the organizations that are firing the rockets and mortars, as well as the civilians who are enabling them to fire and hide" (reserve Major-General); "After this operation there will not be one Hamas building left standing in Gaza" (Deputy IDF Chief of Staff); "Anything affiliated with Hamas is a legitimate target" (IDF Spokesperson's Office). Whereas Israel killed a mere 55 Lebanese during the first two days of the 2006 war, the Israeli media exulted at Israel's "shock and awe" (*Maariv*) as it killed more than 300 Palestinians in the first two days of the attack on Gaza. Several days into the slaughter an informed Israeli strategic analyst observed, "The IDF, which planned to attack buildings and sites populated by hundreds of people, did not warn them in advance to leave, but intended to kill a great many of them, and succeeded." Morris could barely contain his pride at "Israel's highly efficient air assault on Hamas." The Israeli columnist B. Michael was less impressed by the dispatch of helicopter gunships and jet planes "over a giant prison and firing at its people" – for example, "70 . . . traffic cops at their graduation ceremony, young men in desperate search of a livelihood who thought they'd found it in the police and instead found death from the skies."[20]
>
> As Israel targeted schools, mosques, hospitals, ambulances, and U.N. sanctuaries, as it slaughtered and incinerated Gaza's defenseless civilian population (one-third of the 1,200 reported casualties were children), Israeli commentators gloated that "Gaza is to Lebanon as the second sitting for an exam is to the first – a second chance to get it right," and that this time around Israel had "hurled [Gaza] back," not 20 years as it promised to do in Lebanon, but "into the 1940s. Electricity is available only for a few hours a day"; that "Israel regained its deterrence capabilities" because "the war in Gaza has compensated for the shortcomings of the [2006] Second Lebanon War"; and that "There is no doubt that Hezbollah leader Hassan Nasrallah is upset these days. . . . There will no longer be anyone in the Arab world who can claim that Israel is weak."[21]

Israel's "all out war against the civilian population of Gaza" included, Chomsky reminds us, the use of white phosphorus in the shelling of a hospital and a United Nations food warehouse in Gaza City:

> The shelling destroyed "hundreds of tons of emergency food and medicines set for distribution today to shelters, hospitals and feeding centres," according to UNRWA director John Ging. Military strikes at the same time destroyed two floors of the al-Quds hospital, setting it ablaze, and also a second warehouse run by the Palestinian Red Crescent society. The hospital in the densely-populated Tal-Hawa neighbourhood was destroyed by Israeli tanks "after hundreds of frightened Gazans had taken shelter inside as Israeli ground forces pushed into the neighbourhood," *Al-Jazeera* reported.
>
> There was nothing left to salvage inside the smoldering ruins of the hospital. "They shelled the building, the hospital building. It caught fire. We tried to evacuate the sick people and the injured and the people who were there. Firefighters arrived and put out the fire, which burst into flames again and they put it out again and it came back for the third time," paramedic Ahmad Al-Haz told *AP*. It was suspected that the blaze might have been set by white phosphorous, also suspected in numerous other fires and serious burn injuries.[22]
>
> The suspicions were confirmed by Amnesty International after the cessation of the intense bombardment made inquiry possible. Before, Israel had sensibly barred all journalists, even Israeli, while its crimes were proceeding in full fury. Israel's use of white phosphorus against Gaza civilians is "clear and undeniable," AI reported. Its repeated use in densely populated civilian areas "is a war crime," AI concluded. They found white phosphorus edges scattered around residential buildings, still burning, "further endangering the residents and their property," particularly children "drawn to the detritus of war and often unaware of the danger." Primary targets, they report, were the UNRWA compound, where the Israeli "white phosphorus landed next to some fuel trucks and caused a large fire which destroyed tons of humanitarian aid" after Israeli authorities "had given assurance that no further strikes would be launched on the compound." On the same day, "a white phosphorus shell landed in the al-Quds hospital in Gaza City also causing a fire which forced hospital staff to evacuate the patients. . . . White phosphorus landing on skin can burn deep through muscle and into the bone, continuing to burn unless deprived of oxygen." Purposely intended or beyond depraved indifference, such crimes are inevitable when this weapon is used in attacks on civilians.[23]

The fact that Israeli troops used white phosophorus on civilians in Gaza was not mentioned as part of the Williamson affair (although Alan Dershowitz

did drag both Bishop Williamson and Cardinal Martino into his discussion of Gaza) because what people like Alan Dershowitz engage in is an acceptable form of "holocaust denial." Catholic bishops are not permitted to question any aspect of the holocaust narrative, but Jewish law professors and Israeli rabbis are allowed to advocate genocide with impunity. They are allowed to engage in the worst form of "holocaust denial," denial of the holocaust as it is actually happening in places like Gaza. At the risk of having Alan Dershowitz call us anti-Semitic, let's compare Bishop Williamson's comments and the outrage they generated with the silence surrounding the statement of Israeli rabbis who previously urged the IDF to commit war crimes and genocide in Gaza. From a public relations perspective there is no basis for comparison because rabbinic holocaust denial went unmentioned in the press accounts of the Israeli attack on Gaza. As Noam Chomsky points out:

> The ravings of the political and military leaders are mild as compared to the preaching of rabbinical authorities. They are not marginal figures. On the contrary, they are highly influential in the army and in the settler movement, who Zertal and Eldar reveal to be "lords of the land," with enormous impact on policy. . . . Soldiers fighting in northern Gaza were afforded an "inspirational" visit from two leading rabbis, who explained to them that there are no "innocents" in Gaza, so everyone there is a legitimate target, quoting a famous passage from Psalms calling on the Lord to seize the infants of Israel's oppressors and dash them against the rocks. The rabbis were breaking no new ground. A year earlier, the former chief Sephardic rabbi wrote to Prime Minister Olmert, informing him that all civilians in Gaza are collectively guilty for rocket attacks, so that there is "absolutely no moral prohibition against the indiscriminate killing of civilians during a potential massive military offensive on Gaza aimed at stopping the rocket launchings," as the *Jerusalem Post* reported his ruling. His son, chief rabbi of Safed, elaborated: "If they don't stop after we kill 100, then we must kill a thousand, and if they do not stop after 1,000 then we must kill 10,000. If they still don't stop we must kill 100,000, even a million. Whatever it takes to make them stop."[24]

Just as a combination thought experiment and reality check, try to imagine a Catholic bishop making a statement like the one you just read. If you find this hard to imagine, you need to ask a few questions. Why is there outrage when a Catholic bishop raises theoretical historical questions about a war 60 years in the past, but not even a peep of reproach when a rabbi advocates the murder of 1,000, 10,000, 100,000, or even a million Palestinians? Why is the Church silent in the face of this holocaust? Who is the real holocaust denier? Bishop Williamson or Alan Dershowitz?

THOUGHT EXPERIMENT

Let's continue our thought experiment by considering the following allegory. Suppose a German were elected pope. Suppose the Papal States still had an army, as they did during the Middle Ages. Suppose that after ascending the throne of Peter, the German pope began bringing Germans to live with him in the Vatican. After a few months, the Germans who had come to live at the Vatican at the pope's invitation were now running out of room or, to use the German term, "*Lebensraum*." As a result the Germans began moving into adjacent neighborhoods driving the Romans from their homes, killing anyone who resisted, and stealing their property. Whole sections of Rome were ethnically cleansed and the Italians whose property was confiscated by the Germans were rounded up and put in refugee or concentration camps, where they were slowly starved to death by being deprived of food, electricity and water.

Whenever the displaced Romans complained too loudly, the German pope would send in his fleet of helicopter gunships and destroy their hospitals, schools, and other public buildings, especially when the terrorized civilian population would gather there to escape the bombing. The pope's aircraft, supplied by Germany, would also drop white phosphorus bombs on UN warehouses containing food for the starving civilian population. Just before the pope launched this campaign of genocide on the ethnically cleansed Italians, he ordered all of the world's bishops to denounce anyone who protested as "anti-Catholic." The bishops also told the pope's troops that they should have no qualms about killing innocent women and children because Italians were racially inferior and because the Italian Liberation Organization used them as human shields anyway.

Can anyone seriously imagine world opinion tolerating such a situation? If not, how is it that world opinion, including the Catholic Church, tolerates what I have described above when Israelis do it to Palestinians? Doesn't the silence over what is happening in Gaza amount to a much more serious form of "holocaust denial" than anything connected even remotely to what Bishop Williamson said?

"Similar views," Chomsky continues,

> are expressed by prominent American secular figures. When Israel invaded Lebanon in 2006, Harvard Law School Professor Alan Dershowitz explained in the liberal online journal *Huffington Post* that all Lebanese are legitimate targets of Israeli violence. Lebanon's citizens are "paying the price" for supporting "terrorism"—that is, for supporting resistance to Israel's invasion. Accordingly, Lebanese civilians are no more immune to attack than Austrians who supported the Nazis. The fatwa of the Sephardic rabbi applies to them. In a video on the *Jerusalem Post* website, Dershowitz went on to ridicule talk of excessive kill ratios of Palestinians

> to Israelis: it should be increased to 1000-to-one, he said, or even 1000-to-zero, meaning the brutes should be completely exterminated. Of course, he is referring to "terrorists," a broad category that includes the victims of Israeli power, since "Israel never targets civilians," he emphatically declared. It follows that Palestinians, Lebanese, Tunisians, in fact anyone who gets in the way of the ruthless armies of the Holy State is a terrorist, or an accidental victim of their just crimes.[25]
>
> The claim that "our side" never targets civilians is familiar doctrine among those who monopolize the means of violence. And there is some truth to it. We do not generally try to kill particular civilians. Rather, we carry out murderous actions that we know will slaughter many civilians, but without specific intent to kill particular ones. In law, the routine practices might fall under the category of depraved indifference, but that is not an adequate designation for standard imperial practice and doctrine. It is more similar to walking down a street knowing that we might kill ants, but without intent to do so, because they rank so low that it just doesn't matter. The same is true when Israel carries out actions that it knows will kill the "grasshoppers" and "two-legged beasts" who happen to infest the lands it "liberates." There is no good term for this form of moral depravity, arguably worse than deliberate murder, and all too familiar.

Just as *l'affaire Williamson* was dying down, Caesar entered the fray to stir things up again. On January 31, 2009, 50 Catholic politicians wrote to the pope demanding that "you publicly state your unequivocal position on this matter so that it is clear where the Church stands on one of the most consequential events of the 20th century. To neglect to do so is to allow others to portray it as they wish and impede the progress made over so many years toward harmony and reconciliation." The same officials who had grown accustomed to invoking the separation of church and state every time a bishop asked them to vote against abortion, now had no qualms about interfering, *qua* state officials, in the internal workings of the Catholic Church.

By February 2, the Vatican had regained its composure somewhat, and Press Secretary Lombardi had returned to reiterating the Church's initial response, namely, that lifting the excommunication and holocaust denial were two separate issues. But it was only the lull before the next storm, which broke on February 3, when Angela Merkel, Germany's prime minister, turned *l'affaire Williamson* into a Church-State issue by calling on the pope to "clarify the situation." Admitting that she was meddling in the internal affairs of the Church, Merkel plunged forward anyway by claiming that the gravity of the situation demanded it.[26] "The situation is different because we're dealing with fundamental issues," is how she put it.

"This should not be allowed to pass without consequences," Frau Merkel said at a news conference in Berlin. "This is not just a matter, in my opinion,

for the Christian, Catholic and Jewish communities in Germany but the Pope and the Vatican should clarify unambiguously that there can be no [holocaust] denial," Merkel said on Tuesday, February 3. Rather, it is important that the pope clarify "that Holocaust denial cannot be accepted and that, in general, there must be a positive association with Judaism as a whole." She added: "I do not believe that sufficient clarification has been made."

By February 3, it was clear that the German bishops had turned on the pope. Cardinal Lehmann who battled with Pope John Paul II over the German church's approval of abortion counseling at Catholic facilities sided publicly with Merkel. German Catholics were caught up in the lynch mob mentality orchestrated by *Der Spiegel* and Hans Kueng. Many Catholics were appalled at Merkel's interference in what even she admitted were the internal affairs of the Church, but any Catholic voice not caught up in the lynch mob mentality was simply eliminated from the harangue against the pope that all of the major media outlets were orchestrating.

The German rabbis weren't helping matters any. Michel Friedman, former vice-president of the Central Council of German Jews, took the 50-year-old tradition of Catholic-Jewish dialogue to new heights when he went on the "Maintower" program on Hessian Radio Network and called the pope "a liar and a hypocrite." Just think what Friedman might have called the pope without the soothing benefit of *Nostra Aetate*! And why was the pope a hypocrite? Because he claimed to take a stand against "every anti-Semite in the world and every holocaust denier" when in fact, "in the middle of the Vatican he accepts them with open arms."[27]

"Only the excommunication of this anti-Semitic bigot can restore the pope's credibility," Friedman concluded.[28]

With "dialogue" like this, who needed religious wars? Intemperate language like this was beginning to cause a reaction. As one German commentator put it, "the latest media campaign did nothing but widen the chasm separating published opinion and the German people." With each new campaign politics and media lost their last shred of credibility. When *Die Welt* commissioned an on-line poll asking "How do you judge the work of Pope Benedict XVI?" the overwhelming majority (i.e., 64 percent of the 25,000 people taking part in the poll), answered, "Very good. He draws clear lines and does everything right." People commenting in on-line forums were massively censored or deleted or not allowed to answer this question.

CONSPIRACY NUT

Anyone who hinted that the media were orchestrating this outcry was denounced as a conspiracy nut, as when *Spiegel* claimed that "The Vatican is now blaming the incident on a conspiracy to harm the Catholic Church leader."

German Jews, on the other hand, were predictably effusive in their praise of Angela Merkel. "(We have) deep respect and appreciation for the chancellor for the fact that she spoke out on this difficult matter," Stephan Kramer, general secretary of the Central Council of Jews in Germany, told the *Westdeutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*. It shows "the kind of prudence and feeling of responsibility she has," he said. "Kramer's remarks," *Spiegel* continued

> were echoed by Elan Steinberg, vice president of the American Gathering of Jewish Holocaust Survivors and their Descendants. "When the German chancellor admonishes a German-born pope, it is an extraordinary message," Steinberg wrote in an e-mail to the Associated Press. "Together with the expressions of outrage emanating from German and Austrian bishops, these developments have ironically strengthened relations between Germany and the world Jewish community."

Comments like this, however, strengthened the feeling among rank and file German Catholics that the Jews had bribed Merkel to intervene in what she clearly felt was an intra-Catholic issue with a potentially large political downside for her if it backfired.

On February 4, in response to Merkel's call for "*Klarstellung*" the Vatican issued a statement claiming that Bishop Williamson would have to deny "Holocaust denial" before he could be readmitted to the Church as a bishop in good standing. Under the heading, "Declarations on the Shoah," the Vatican Secretary of State announced that

> The positions of Mons. Williamson on the Shoah are absolutely unacceptable and firmly rejected by the Holy Father, as he himself remarked on the past January 28, when, referring to that brutal genocide, he reaffirmed his full and unquestionable solidarity with our Brethren, receivers of the First Covenant, and affirmed that the memory of that terrible genocide must lead "mankind to reflect on the unpredictable power of evil when it conquers the heart of man", adding that the Shoah remains "for all a warning against forgetfulness, against denial or reductionism, because the violence against a single human being is violence against all."[29]

> Bishop Williamson, for an admission to episcopal functions in the Church, will also have to distance himself, in an absolutely unequivocal and public manner, from his positions regarding the Shoah, unknown to the Holy Father in the moment of the remission of the excommunication.

Jewish reaction to the announcement was predictable. "This was the sign the Jewish world has been waiting for," said Ronald Lauder, president of the World Jewish Congress.

In making the announcement, Rome pleaded for prayers and support for the pope as the "Custodian of Unity" in the Church, and well it might because

requiring Bishop Williamson to deny "Holocaust denial" had the potential for being the biggest public relations disaster of the entire Williamson affair, if for no other reason than the number of people it affected. In attempting to restore unity to the Church, the pope had enraged the Jews. Now in attempting to placate the Jews, the pope ran the risk of alienating over one billion rank and file Catholics by giving them the impression that the Holocaust narrative was now an article of Faith. Michael Hoffman II, author of *Judaism Discovered*, made similar claims in an e-mail he sent to the pope:

> Is the rabbinic "Shoah" mysticism now a dogma of the Roman Catholic Church? . . . Do Catholics no longer have the right to doubt or question aspects of secular history? Does the Magsterium [*sic*] of the Church now decree the undoubted veracity of the figure of Six Million deceased Judaic persons, and the undoubted existence of a mass killing operation in Auschwitz-Birkenau, conducted by means of poison gas chambers?
>
> Are you aware of the extent to which the Crucifixion of Christ has been replaced by Auschwitz as the central ontological event of western history? Do you wish to be complicit in the disastrous effects that continue to accrue from this derogation of Jesus and deification of man?

One anonymous commentator on the web made much the same point when he claimed that:

> In the past, a dogma referred only to a matter of Christian faith, and Catholics could believe whatever they wanted about historical events. But today's remarks from the Vatican make it clear that the Jewish version of the Holocaust, in which 6 million Jews were killed in gas chambers, must be believed by every Catholic or they're not in communion with the Church. That makes the Holocaust an official dogma of the Catholic Faith.

ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION

The situation, however, was neither that bad nor that simple. Theologian Raymond Kevane claims that it is impossible to globalize from what is essentially an administrative decision by the pope.

> What the Pope did was to make a priestly and administrative decision which related precisely and only to those four bishops: absolve them from their censures, and then reprimand the one for making an unfortunate public statement. The Pope was making no theological or doctrinal statement. I believe the Pope's overall purpose was obscured by the stupidity of one of the bishops the Pope was being kind to: It appears to me that he wants to reinstate in some fashion the liturgy of an earlier time which has been lost.

As Robert Sungenis, the theologian whose article in *Culture Wars* got the American bishops to remove their statement that the Mosaic covenant was "eternally valid" from their catechism, put it:

> The pope is not insisting on a recanting of his 'holocaust denial' as a requirement to being readmitted to the Church, but only as a requirement for having his canonical function as a bishop restored, or what the Vatican called his being 'reinstated to episcopal service.'
>
> Canonically, the pope does have the authority to bind Williamson in this way, since according to Vatican I, the pope's disciplinary powers over his clerics are unlimited and no one can question them. So, right or wrong on insisting Williamson recant his position, the pope has the right to enact disciplinary measures against Williamson.

Sungenis feels that the Vatican, by placing this requirement on Williamson, "has put itself in a win-win situation," because "it knows that Williamson is probably not going to recant, so he can then be used as the scapegoat. All the blame for whatever is bad about traditionalist extremism will be heaped on Williamson, and then Fellay and the other three bishops will be eventually re-commissioned under the good grace of both the Catholic Church and the Jews."

On the other hand, "if Williamson does recant, the pope still wins, only more dramatically, since now the SSPX has fully submitted to his power (and the Jews are happy that the pope has submitted to their power)."

> The only lagging, yet supremely important issue remaining regards the ethical validity of the pope's insistence that Williamson recant his opinion without a canonical trial to see if his opinion is, indeed, worthy of its claims. Since Williams is being accused of being 'anti-Semitic' for denying a so-called 'fact of history' about the Semites, and since 'anti-Semitism' is a mortal sin in the Catholic Church, then a trial is the only recourse for determining if, indeed, Williamson is guilty of 'anti-Semitism,' for that could be the only grounds upon which he could be formally disciplined by the pope.

Sungenis went on to say that any "canonical trial to determine whether Williamson is guilty of anti-Semitism" would "require a legal investigation of whether there were indeed, six million Jews gassed by the Nazis. This puts the burden on the Vatican to prove their case in open court, and severely curtails the Jewish court of public opinion that is now running the show."

So, in terms of actual theological fact, no, the holocaust has not been declared a dogma of the Church. But in terms of perception, the Catholic faithful once more learn that their concerns take a back seat to the feelings of the Jews. In terms of perception, it certainly looked as if the pope caved in to the demands of the emperor and the Jews who were egging her on.

The pope's capitulation to Merkel's demands raised all sorts of historical parallels. Now it was the pope and not Barbarossa, the German Emperor, who had to stand barefoot in the snow at Canossa. This time it was a woman and not Napoleon who slapped the pope in the face. What Marx referred to as "the cunning of history" was far from exhausted by these two examples.

Sandro Magister, the Italian George Weigel, showed his neocon sympathies when he raised Vatican II to the level of the creed. But in doing so, Magister, in an equally neocon way, raised an issue with uncanny historical ramifications, namely, the issue of the pope's "silence."

> For some, it was easy to throw into the faces of the Vatican authorities their excessive silence on another, much more dangerous form of denial of the Holocaust, the one publicly supported by the leaders of Iran. In the almost four years of his pontificate, in effect, only once has an official Vatican document condemned, in vague words, Iran's intention of wiping Israel from the face of the earth.

Pope Benedict is now doing exactly what the Jews accused Pius XII of doing. The Jews allege that Pius XII capitulated to the German Chancellor, which is precisely what Benedict did when faced with Merkel's threat. The Jews claim that Pius XII was silent when he should have denounced the holocaust, which is precisely what happened during the final two weeks of December 2008. The near total silence emanating from Rome at the time of the Israeli war crimes against the Palestinians in Gaza during the last two weeks of 2008 was positively deafening.

By February 10, it looked as if the chain of events was going to prove Sungenis right. Bishop Williamson was being made the scapegoat. After telling *Spiegel* that he planned to reconsider his views on the Holocaust—a process that would "take time," Williamson claimed—Fellay ordered the Rev. Christian Bouchacourt, director of the Latin American branch of the SSPX, to fire Williamson from his job as rector of the SSPX seminary in La Reja, Argentina. Bouchacourt claimed that Williamson's views "in no way reflect the position of our congregation" and that by expressing them, Williamson had "discredited" the SSPX.

With Williamson out of the way, Catholic-Jewish dialogue could resume. That meant that the pope could once again talk to people like Rabbi Shmuley Boteach, who weighed in with his own contribution to dialogue by writing an article in the *Jerusalem Post* entitled: "The Pope Must Condemn the Jew-haters in the Church." Boteach, who, like every other rabbi, is an expert in Catholic theology, applauded Angela Merkel, who "is reaching out to a pope to teach him morality." Unfortunately, the pope is a slow learner; "he has yet to simply kick the bishop back to where he belongs—a state of excommunication from the Catholic Church." So—*pace*, Dr. Sungenis—Holocaust denial is an excommunicable offense after all. It must be true, if Rabbi Shmuley says so.

What follows is Boteach's character assassination of Pius XII, whom the rabbi refers to as "Hitler's pope." As an example of Pius XII's heinous crimes, Boteach mentions that he actually "granted a secret audience to Supreme SS Polizeiführer Karl Wolff." As we all know from reading the parable of the Good Samaritan, rabbis like Boteach consider people like Wolff ritually unclean. Just being in the same room with a "Supreme SS Polizeiführer" is enough to bring about moral contamination, something Rabbi Shmuley alludes to when he says, "That Pius realized he was doing something that others would regard as immoral is attested to by the fact that the meeting took place in great secrecy and Wolff came dressed in disguise." Are we to imagine Pius XII calling Wolff on the phone and telling him to come in disguise? Or are there other more plausible explanations here? Whatever. Rabbis have the charism of infallibility when it comes to reading other people's minds, especially the minds of dead popes. But not content to leave it at that, Rabbi Shmuley feels compelled to come up with the smoking gun in the Pius XII case. The pope, according to Boteach condemns himself with his own words, or at least the words of Karl Wolff. "Years later," Boteach writes, "Wolff had this to say about the meeting: 'From the pope's own words I could sense the sincerity of his sympathy and how much he loved the German people.'" We can imagine Rabbi Boteach rending his garments and crying out, "You have heard the blasphemy. Pius XII said that he loved the German people! What need of witnesses have we now!" If Pope Benedict wants to know what God thinks of Catholic-Jewish dialogue, we recommend a reading of St. Matthew's account of the Passion and Death of our Savior, in particular 26: 57-68. As a further indication of what the pope can learn by engaging in dialogue with people like Rabbi Shmuley, we read:

> The Catholic Church has come a long, long way from its anti-Semitic past. This was done primarily though the courage of three of the four most recent popes, great men all, beginning with John XXIII, continuing with John Paul II and culminating in the warm friendship offered to the Jewish community by Pope Benedict. So why would the pope undermine the warm and outstretched hand he has offered the Jewish community by demanding that the sins of his predecessor, the unrighteous Pius XII, be expunged by his victims?"

Why, indeed?! At this point more important questions arise, namely, why would anyone, much less the pope, want to talk to an ignorant bigot like Shmuley Boteach? Doesn't the pope have better things to do? Perhaps as a first step in re-starting Catholic-Jewish dialogue, the pope can appoint a commission to untangle Rabbi Shmuley's Talmudic syntax. Then, they can move on to deciphering his mixed metaphors. Why is the pope undermining the warm and outstretched hand he has offered the Jewish community? This is Boteach at his irenic best! If this is the way rabbis engage in dialogue with

the pope, we can imagine how they talk in private. And that, of course, raises the real issue, namely, why does the pope want to talk to people like this? Haven't we had enough of this already? With dialogue like this, who needs logomachy?

And with these questions still unanswered, we come to the heart of the Williamson affair. The lesson of the last 50 years of dialogue is now clear: the Church can have unity or she can have good relations with the Jews, but she can't have both. The two options are mutually exclusive. The more the pope talks with the Jews, the more he destroys the unity of the Church; the more the pope attempts to restore unity, as in his lifting of the excommunication of the four bishops, the more he enrages the Jews.

NON DATUR TERTIUS

We continue to witness one of the greatest course corrections in the history of the Church. The post-Vatican II era of covert Jewish warfare under the name of irenic dialogue is over. The warfare is out in the open now. Dragging Vatican II into this discussion is a red herring. *Nostra Aetate* was not heretical, but the project of Catholic-Jewish relations based on *Nostra Aetate* can't be construed as anything other than a failed experiment. It failed because Rome took as its model Jew Nathan der Weise and not God's verdict as expressed in I Thess 2: 15.

In spite of all of the missteps of the Williamson affair, the Church is slowly regaining its footing and its willingness to articulate its traditional position against the people that St. Paul referred to as enemies of all mankind. If we need empirical evidence that the Jews are "the enemies of the whole human race," footage of the carnage in Gaza should suffice to convince even the most skeptical Philosemite that rejection of Logos has terrible consequences. St. Paul's statement is as relevant today when we were forced to stand by helplessly and watch the slaughter of 1,300 Palestinians at the hands of the Israelis as it was when St. Paul first wrote those words. The irony of the past 50 years of Catholic-Jewish dialogue is that it has placed the current pope in precisely the situation the Jews have falsely attributed to Pope Pius XII. When Cardinal Martino referred to Gaza as a concentration camp, his remarks sparked outrage among the Jews. His comment, however, only points at the silence of the Church on the ongoing Palestinian genocide in Gaza.

The Lefebvrite schism has hurt the Church, but it has hurt the Lefbvrites even more. Like all schisms it was based on lack of charity, which Catholics consider the worst sin. As St. Paul says (I Cor 13: 1), "If I have all the eloquence of men or of angels, but speak without love I am simply a gong booming or a cymbal clashing. . . . If I give away all that I possess, piece by piece, and if I even let them take my body to burn it, but am without love, it will do me no good whatsoever."

Reunion, as the pope pointed out in the letter that set off *l'affaire Williamson*, means the triumph of charity. Reunion, as Bishop Fellay points out, also means a rehabilitation of tradition. Reunion means that the Church regains her strength. All of this has consequences for the Jews. When the Church is strong, the Jews are weak. The Middle Ages are evidence of that. When the Church is weak, the Jews are strong. The last 50 years are certainly evidence of that. The Jews don't want this wound to be healed for obvious reasons. But as Henry V said after the French embassy had gone back to their lines to prepare for an attack, "Our lives are in God's hands, not theirs."

HOLOCAUST DENIAL AND THOUGHT CONTROL DEBORAH LIPSTADT AD GENTES

Omnes Alios Hostile Odium (All strangers they hate as enemies)
–Tacitus on the Jews

On March 25, 2009, Notre Dame was embroiled in the biggest controversy to hit the campus since the performance of *The Vagina Monologues*. A few days earlier, Notre Dame president John Jenkins, CSC had announced that the university planned to give President Barack Obama an honorary doctorate. Within hours of the announcement a storm of protest erupted which showed no sign of dying down any time soon. Citing the statement of the U.S. Catholic Bishops in 2004—"The Catholic community and Catholic institutions should not honor those who act in defiance of our fundamental moral principles. They should not be given awards, honors or platforms which would suggest support for their actions"—the ordinary of the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, John M. D'Arcy announced that, for the first time in 25 years, he would not be attending graduation ceremonies at Notre Dame, because "President Obama has recently affirmed, and has now placed in public policy, his long stated unwillingness to hold human life as sacred."

By March 25, 2009 over 100,000 people had signed a petition condemning Notre Dame's actions, and Bishop Thomas J. Olmstead of the Phoenix, Arizona diocese joined with his colleague Bishop D'Arcy in denouncing Jenkins' decision, calling the decision to honor President Obama a "public act of disobedience" and a "grave mistake."

Instead of addressing the running sore that is the Catholic identity issue at Notre Dame, the provost of that institution along with the Notre Dame Holocaust Project invited a "renowned historian" to address the issue of "holocaust denial," a delict which has succeeded patriotism as the last refuge of scoundrels. The "renowned historian" in question was Deborah Lipstadt, who, according to the press release sent out weeks in advance, is the director of the Rabbi Donald A. Tam Institute for Jewish Studies and is currently

on leave of absence at the Center for Advanced Holocaust Studies at the Holocaust Museum in Washington DC.

The invitation was hastily extended in the wake of the Williamson Affair. In hosting the speech, Notre Dame could establish its academic *bona fides* by inviting a Jew in to beat up a Catholic bishop. Needless to say, I wanted to get to the lecture early so that I could get a seat. Expecting a ropes-up crowd, I was disappointed to find a sparsely attended hall. If it weren't for a busload of middle-aged Jewish ladies brought in from the south side of town, the hall would have been virtually empty. Lipstadt was introduced by a chubby middle-aged man who looked like a professor (he wasn't wearing a tie), but it was hard to tell whether he was Catholic or Jewish, a state of affairs that is also applicable to Notre Dame as an institution. Professor Lipstadt and the man who introduced her kept referring to Bishop Williamson as the "alleged" Bishop Williamson, showing their ignorance of the English language and Catholic theology. As already stated, Bishop Williamson was consecrated a bishop in 1988 by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre. His consecration was valid but not licit because it was done in defiance of Rome. For that act, the six bishops involved were excommunicated *latae sententiae*. Pope Benedict lifted the excommunications and set off the Williamson affair.

As further evidence of her renown, Professor Lipstadt's introducer told us that Professor Lipstadt "discussed alleged Bishop Williamson's holocaust denial on her blog," and that this blogging "may have helped the Vatican see the light." After informing the pope that he "must unequivocally distance himself from [alleged Bishops Williamson's] views," Professor Lipstadt concluded, again on her blog, that "I think [the pope] was willing to tolerate these views in the name of unity."

Given the nature of Catholic response to the Williamson affair, one would think that Professor Lipstadt would have been pleased, but this was not the case. In one of the most groveling responses, Roger Cardinal Mahony, archbishop of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, barred Bishop Williamson from setting foot in any Catholic building in the archdiocese. Again, one would think that Professor Lipstadt would be pleased by an action like this, but that was not the case. In a comment which, according to her blog, she posted at 4:42 AM [!] March 2, 2009, Lipstadt dismissed Mahony's gesture as "largely symbolic in that Williamson has not given any sign that LA was on his travel itinerary." If Cardinal Mahony thought an attack on a fellow Catholic bishop would ingratiate him with the likes of Professor Lipstadt, he obviously had not reckoned with Professor Lipstadt's high standards. "What I found jarring," she continued, "was the statement by the spokesman for the archdiocese. 'The cardinal wished to send a clear signal to the Jewish community that Williamson is not a member or even welcome in the Catholic Church until he renounces his views.'"

"This," Lipstadt sniffed indignantly,

> should not be a message to the Jewish Community but to all people who think truth is important – irrespective of their faith. It would be a message that people who lie about history, distort the truth, express anti-Semitic and racist views, and pervert facts in order to defend one of the most diabolical regimes in history are not welcome in the LA archdiocese. Racists, for example, should be shunned not to send a message to minority communities but because racists spread hatred, instill contempt, and work against communal tranquility.
>
> I don't mean to quibble over this strong statement on Cardinal Mahony's part. But to do this and define it as a message to the 'victims' is to miss the point.

That being said, she was nonetheless pleased with her two-day stay at Notre Dame, which she described as "an institution which takes its Catholic identity seriously."

Before too long into the introduction, it became clear that Professor Lipstadt established her credentials as a "renowned historian," by writing "three books," two of which bear variations on the title "Denying the Holocaust." Not content with her own unearned laurels, Lipstadt is obsessed with denying the qualifications which others have earned honestly. In a letter on her blog which she sent to the *New York Times*, Lipstadt takes issue with the *Times* referring to David Irving, who has written more than three books, as a "historian." Instead of referring to Irving as a "historian," the *Times* should have called him a "denier."

Her three books notwithstanding, Lipstadt's real claim to fame came from the fact that she was a defendant in a libel suit, something the Notre Dame press release pointed out. A book on that trial constitutes one-third of all of her book-length writing over the past 23 years. As some indication of the depth of her overall scholarship, Lipstadt assigned the "Holocaust memoir" called *Fragments* in her classes. When the book was revealed as a threadbare hoax written by a non-Jew who had never been near a concentration camp, Lipstadt opined that, if the allegation turned out to be true (which it did), this "might complicate matters somewhat," but insisted that it would still be "powerful as a novel."

Professor Lipstadt was supposed to have been introduced by Rabbi Michael Signer. This is fitting because Signer was also the recipient of an endowed chair, he at Notre Dame, for producing even less intellectual material than Professor Lipstadt. Rabbi Signer could not attend the lecture because he died in January but Professor Lipstadt assured her audience that he is now "up there watching us."

Even more than being a defendant in a libel suit, Professor Lipstadt's renown comes from her efforts to prevent the spread of the delict known as "holocaust denial." The point of her talk at Notre Dame was explaining the

full ramifications of this invention. As we have come to expect from speakers like this, Professor Lipstadt feels that another *Kristalnacht* is right around the corner. "I see things," she confided to the yentas from the south side, "as bleaker than I used to see them." Over the past year, there has been "an uptick in anti-Semitism," something that should be "a source of tremendous concern."

Of course, given her expansive notion of anti-Semitism—"Holocaust denial is a form of anti-Semitism"; it is "the new anti-Semitism"—"uptick" is hardly the proper term. The Holocaust itself begins to pale in comparison to the threats now on the horizon—not that I am accusing Professor Lipstadt of Holocaust denial. According to Professor Lipstadt's definition, anyone who says the word apartheid and Israel in the same sentence is guilty of the "new anti-Semitism." The term "Israel Apartheid" was, of course, a veiled reference to former President Jimmy Carter, who is now routinely dismissed as an anti-Semite. Perhaps "New Anti-Semite" might be a better term, since it corresponds with the "New Anti-Semitism" and reflects, of course, the fact that no Jew dared to level the term when Carter was president.

At this point, Professor Lipstadt was just warming to her topic. Any claim, she continued, that Zionism is a form of racism or anything linking Israel and South Africa also constitutes anti-Semitism. The same goes for UN resolutions condemning Israeli behavior toward Palestinians, something she terms "legalized anti-Semitism." The same goes for people who refer to Jews as a group, as in what she terms "the so-called Jewish lobby," which was a veiled reference to Walt and Mearsheimer's book on the Israel Lobby. Anti-Semitism has even infected "some parts of Belgium"!

Which brings us to the heart of the "new anti-Semitism," otherwise known as Holocaust denial. There are two forms of Holocaust denial: Hard core and soft-core. As examples of hard-core holocaust denial, Lipstadt mentioned David Irving and "so-called Bishop Williamson." Lipstadt also objects to historians who claim that "otherwise David Irving is a good historian," making it clear that they are guilty of what might be termed second-hand Holocaust denial, a pathogen that is contracted by intellectual proximity in analogous fashion to how lung cancer is supposedly contracted by second-hand smoke.

Then there is soft-core Holocaust denial. As examples thereof, Lipstadt listed things like "cancellation of Holocaust remembrance day celebrations," something that happened in Barcelona recently, "because of Israeli behavior in Gaza." As another example of soft-core Holocaust denial, Lipstadt mentioned "Eastern European countries, governments arguing that Nazis and Communists were equivalent, and that the communists perpetuated genocide." The fact that a Jewish resistance fighter was indicted by the Lithuanian government for war crimes committed while he was a partisan is an instance of soft-core Holocaust denial, according to Professor Lipstadt.

Another example of soft-core denial was Mel Gibson's interview at the time of the release of *The Passion of the Christ*—which the Jews, according to Professor Lipstadt, made into a blockbuster by their protests.

Mel Gibson became a Holocaust denier, in Professor Lipstadt's eyes, when he mentioned in an interview with Diane Sawyer that "in the Ukraine millions of people were starved to death." As Norman Finkelstein has pointed out in his book *The Holocaust Industry*:

> To question a survivor's testimony, to denounce the role of Jewish collaborators, to suggest that Germans suffered during the bombing of Dresden or that any state except Germany committed crimes in World War II – this is all evidence, according to Lipstadt of Holocaust denial. . . . The most "insidious" forms of Holocaust denial, Lipstadt suggest, are "immoral equivalencies": that is denying the uniqueness of The Holocaust.

As conclusive and irrefutable proof that Mel Gibson is a Holocaust denier, Lipstadt mentioned that he said in the same interview that the Jews "died at Auschwitz," not that they were "murdered," which is what he should have said if he wanted to avoid the charge of anti-Semitism. Holocaust denial is also something that can be contracted genetically, like the *goyische* equivalent of Tay-Sachs disease. Professor Lipstadt makes it clear that Mel Gibson contracted it from his father, or better, because he refused to denounce his father, who was a Holocaust denier. As further proof of Mel Gibson's "soft-core holocaust denial," Professor Lipstadt claimed that Gibson said, "My father never lied to me in his life." (Does this mean that genetic transmission of Holocaust denial causes an amelioration from the hard-core variety manifested by Hutton Gibson into the soft-core variety manifested by his son? If so, what are the prospects for the third generation? Holocaust doubt?) We are left to assume that Gibson should have behaved more like little Pavlik Moroslav, the Ukrainian boy who denounced his father to the Soviet secret police. Little Pavlik was murdered by his outraged relatives, but the Soviets erected statues and schools in his honor.

Having come up with the taxonomy of Holocaust denial, Lipstadt then segued into a discussion of her main claim to fame, namely, the fact that David Irving named her as a defendant in a libel suit, which she characterized as being taken out of line and shot. It seems that every cloud has a silver lining. So when Professor Lipstadt was sued for libel, it allowed her and a team of researchers to delve into the work of people like David Irving. Since she had already written a book mentioning Irving, this wasn't especially reassuring, but oblivious to that fact, Lipstadt launched into an analysis of two footnotes. In one instance Irving claimed that Hitler was furious at one of his lieutenants for attacking a Jewish delicatessen at the time of the 1923 beer hall putsch. What Lipstadt uncovered was that Hitler was really furious because the

lieutenant didn't wear his uniform during the attack. According to Lipstadt, this discrepancy proves that David Irving made it all up. In recounting this anecdote, Lipstadt seems oblivious that she is testifying to Irving's acumen as a historian and his ability to get to little known facts. Whether what he said is accurate in detail is precisely the role of historical research, an activity she prohibits in anyone who disagrees with her point of view.

In a second instance, Irving claimed that Hitler was furious that Nazis were attacking Jewish businesses and ordered them to stop. What Lipstadt and her team of investigators uncovered is that Hitler was only upset by the arson, but even if that is the case, it is not clear why historical research should be a legal matter. Don't people write books to have them discussed? Isn't this why we have universities and professors? Isn't this how we learn about the past? Not according to Professor Lipstadt.

The academy exists, in Lipstadt's view, not to pursue the truth but to punish malefactors who are guilty of thought crimes. What becomes equally apparent is just how blood-thirsty Professor Lipstadt can be when it comes to pursuing her enemies. We are talking about something more than personal animus. We are talking about racial or ethnic animus of the sort that gets expressed in the later novels of Philip Roth or in the late Richard John Neuhaus's magazine *First Things*, where Meir Soloveichik declared that hate is a Jewish virtue.

Lipstadt expressed this hatred by way of anecdote. During her libel trial, Lipstadt was shocked to hear her lawyer tell a BBC interviewer that David Irving wasn't important. When she pressed him on this after the interview, her lawyer assured her that "David Irving was like the dirt"—Lipstadt paused at this point and added parenthetically "he used another word"—"you step into on the street. The dirt's not important, what's important is that you remove it from your shoe." Lipstadt then referred to the claim that David Irving was a piece of dog shit as "a wonderful analogy" because it "helped her to understand" how to deal with people like this.

Lipstadt doesn't apply epithets like that to the *goyim* alone; she also applied the same description verbatim to Norman Finkelstein. In responding to a call when Lipstadt was on a program on National Public Radio, Lipstadt said of Finkelstein: "Think of the dirt you step in on the street and you know what kind of dirt I'm talking about. It has no importance unless you fail to clean it off your shoe before you go into the house." Lipstadt's outburst prompted one listener to write in, "If Professor Lipstadt disagrees with Professor Finkelstein, I suggest that she debate him on the facts instead of being allowed to launch vulgar personal attacks on *NPR* with impunity."

In an interview posted on the Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs website (#11, August 1, 2003) Lipstadt claimed that "as an American," she was "a staunch believer in free speech," but that "the situation in Germany is different and that there might be room there for a law against Holocaust denial." What comes across here is a strong belief in double standards, which comes down

to praising the academy and then using it as a podium for referring to other people as dog shit. Once again, the academy is instrumentalized into a weapon against Holocaust deniers, which is to say, people whom organized Jewry portrays as enemies of the Jewish race, and a place to settle ancestral scores.

Her goal is clear: to get everyone else to view her opponents as dog shit; her quandary, however, is strategic, namely, how to "defeat them and not build them up." As she put it in her talk, "How do you fight these people without building them up or giving them some merit?" The answer to that question is "dynamic silence," a theory developed by the AJC in dealing with Gerald L. K. Smith in the '50s, and recounted in Benjamin Ginsberg's book *Fatal Embrace*. Professor Lipstadt, however, got her answer from the lawyer in the Irving libel action. Lipstadt may or may not have read *Fatal Embrace*, but her talk and the hatred she spewed onto her enemies indicates that disinterested pursuit of the truth is not Professor Lipstadt's goal in life. It's not enough to disagree, as serious historians can and do, with certain assertions in David Irving's writings. Professor Lipstadt insists on total denunciation of everything David Irving ever wrote, followed by a concerted attempt to deprive him of his ability to earn a livelihood. On her blog, Lipstadt gloats that Irving has been reduced to selling Nazi memorabilia, as if concerted efforts to blacklist him in the publishing industry had nothing to do with that.

Anyone who does not go along with this campaign is suspect and guilty of fraternizing with the enemy, which also calls for reprisals. In this Lipstadt differs from Norman Finkelstein, who writes:

> Not all revisionist literature—however scurrilous the politics or motivations of its practitioners—is totally useless. . . . [David] Irving, notorious as an admirer of Hitler and sympathizer with German national socialism, has nevertheless, as Gordon Craig points out, made an "indispensable" contribution to our knowledge of World War II. Both Arno Mayer, in his important study of the Nazi holocaust, and Raul Hilberg cite Holocaust denial publications. "If these people want to speak, let them," Hilberg observes, "It only leads those of us who do the research to re-examine what we might have considered as obvious"[30]

Deborah Lipstadt doesn't want to disagree with David Irving. She wants to first humiliate and then destroy him. "We stripped Irving bare," Lipstadt told her audience at Notre Dame. "We made him look silly." Not content to leave it at that, Lipstadt continued that she took out two movies, Charlie Chaplin's *The Great Dictator* and Mel Brooks' *The Producers*. She learned from watching these movies it's not enough to defeat your enemies (no one brought up that Lipstadt's enemies were people who had written books with which she disagreed), "The point was to dress him in a jester's costume and make him a witness to his own powerlessness."

In other words, academe is for Lipstadt simply the arena in which she humiliates her foes. This view was expressed repeatedly during her talk. Persuasion is not her strong suit, and that, of course, means that it has no place in academic life. "Trying to convince holocaust deniers," she said, "is a hopeless task." It is also a circular argument, to which Professor Lipstadt is as blind as the image of *Synagoga* on the façade of the cathedral portal in Strassbourg.

Professor Lipstadt credits her researchers with the victory over David Irving, but in doing so reinforces the idea that the academy has been weaponized: "The trial was a great tribute to academia; they tracked down that information."

Given all of the resources at her disposal, I began to wonder why Professor Lipstadt hasn't written the definitive Holocaust narrative. In spite of the resources at her disposal, and the fact that she is now on leave of absence from Emory University spending a year immersing herself in "Advanced Holocaust Studies" at the Holocaust Museum in Washington, the only thing she has produced during the last 16 years is an account of the Irving trial. In fact, in the 16 years which have elapsed since she invented the term "holocaust denial," she has produced not one piece of historical scholarship on the period in question. Instead of laying these issues to rest the way scholars do, i.e., with a piece of competent scholarship, Lipstadt has decided to resolve the issue by *force majeure*.

Why is this? Well, maybe it's because Professor Lipstadt's day job as thought cop keeps her so busy she can't do anything else. In her professional activity Professor Lipstadt resembles less the scholar and more the political commissars assigned to units of the Soviet Army or the interrogators at the Cheka, the Soviet secret police, positions that were more often than not staffed by Jews, as Jewish historians have noted,[31] and as I have discussed in detail in volume two.

Professor Lipstadt is the spiritual descendant of these Jewish investigators. Professor Lipstadt's job is to shoot anybody in academe or publishing (the current equivalent of the Soviet army) who is not following the party line. Since she can't very well go out and shoot David Irving literally, she does the next best thing by assassinating his character by claiming that he is not really a historian (certainly not a "renowned historian" like Professor Lipstadt) and depriving him of a livelihood.

Professor David O'Connell, who teaches French at Georgia State University, found this out when he published an article on Elie Wiesel in *Culture Wars*. O'Connell's article did what scholarship is supposed to do. It pointed out inconsistencies in the conventional narrative that academe had been cowed into ignoring. It pointed out patent absurdities like the famous picture of Wiesel in Buchenwald; it pointed up the discrepancies in the various accounts Wiesel has given of his liberation from Buchenwald. It brought up

the fact that after the release of the PBS documentary *The Liberators*, which purported to describe how an all-Black tank battalion liberated Buchenwald, Wiesel suddenly became aware of memories he never had before, memories of being liberated by Black soldiers emerging from Sherman tanks. "I will always remember with love," Wiesel wrote in 1989, "a big black soldier. He was crying like a child—tears of all the pain in the world and all the rage. Everyone who was there that day will forever feel a sentiment of gratitude to the American soldiers who liberated us."

It was a truly touching moment. Unfortunately, it never happened. *Liberators* was made up "to increase Black and Jewish mutual understanding in Brooklyn," and Elie Wiesel wittingly collaborated in that scam. O'Connell's article not only damaged Elie Wiesel's reputation, it also called significant segments of the Holocaust narrative, in particular those recounted by Wiesel, into question. Did Professor O'Connell's *Culture Wars* article then constitute Holocaust denial? This is where the story gets interesting.

After O'Connell's article on Wiesel appeared in the October 2004 issue of *Culture Wars*, Lipstadt wrote to the administration at Georgia State University in an attempt to get him fired. She claimed in her letter that O'Connell had engaged in "fraud in research." What followed was several pages of single spaced writing in which she questioned O'Connell's spelling of Yiddish and labored mightily to convict Professor O'Connell of fraud. Unwilling to dismiss Lipstadt's letter, the administration at GSU appointed a panel of three full professors to look into the matter. After deliberating for almost a year, from December 2005 to October 2006, the professors concluded that there was no fraud, or that if there were, it was the doing of Elie Wiesel and not Professor O'Connell. If Professor O'Connell didn't get fired, it wasn't for Professor Lipstadt's lack of trying. The fault lay not in Professor Lipstadt's will but in her intellect. In spite of her endowed chair and years immersed in "advanced holocaust studies," she couldn't mount a coherent argument. Every claim she raised was ultimately dismissed as baseless. It was as if she felt she could carry the day by sheer force of will, and was upset to learn that academic life still had a remnant of integrity.

There is probably another reason why the attempt to oust Professor O'Connell failed. The administration at GSU knew if they fired O'Connell on trumped up charges of fraud, he would then sue them, and the lawsuit would lead to a discovery process that would have been disastrous for both the university and the system of thought control run by the powerful Jews who were orchestrating the campaign, demanding vengeance. In a way, it's a shame this case didn't go to trial. It would have been interesting to learn how Professor Lipstadt heard about Professor O'Connell's article, and it would have provided a nice counterpoint to the Lipstadt-Irving libel trial in London. It would also have exposed the inner workings of Jewish thought police like

Deborah Lipstadt and the role she plays as an enforcer of the Jewish hegemony over academe today.

The O'Connell case makes an interesting counterpoint to the Williamson case as well. Unlike Professor O'Connell, Bishop Williamson did no research, published no article or book, and so had no way to fight back when the counterattack came. This is why he was such a tempting target. This is also why the Jewish organizations have stayed away from David O'Connell. They tried to get him fired and failed because O'Connell had all the facts on his side, and there was nothing that organized Jewry could do about it. As a result, Lipstadt *et al* shifted to the tactic of "dynamic silence," and there the situation at GSU has remained ever since. Professor O'Connell has challenged Professor Lipstadt to a debate, but, as we learned when we attended her talk, Professor Lipstadt doesn't debate Holocaust deniers. But in this case, that logic isn't compelling, because she herself had to certify that Professor O'Connell was not a Holocaust denier. Unable to prove that O'Connell engaged in fraud, Lipstadt was unable to claim that he was a Holocaust denier. Since she comments on every conceivable delict under the sun on her blog, it seems odd that Professor Lipstadt didn't comment on the challenge to debate the Williamson affair from Professor O'Connell, a man who teaches not far away from where she holds her chair. The logistics of a debate would hardly be insurmountable, or are there other considerations at work?

I tried to get some idea of the limits of the Holocaust narrative in the question and answer period after her talk. What I got instead was more evidence for the circularity of the term. My question concerned the documentary about the 761st Tank Battalion, an all-Negro unit, which allegedly liberated Buchenwald. Was it Holocaust denial to say that it never happened?

Lipstadt was forced to admit that the Tank Battalion/Buchenwald story was, as she put it in another context, "pure invention," but she refused to see any implications in this for the Holocaust narrative as a whole or for Wiesel's credibility. Wiesel, she claimed, dealing with the latter instance first, was talking about other Black soldiers, but since the army wasn't integrated at that point, that would have to mean other Black units, and there were none in the area at the time. As Professor O'Connell pointed out in the article that Lipstadt and presumably her researchers meticulously vetted, "He [Wiesel] made this statement despite the fact that there were no Blacks present at the liberation of Buchenwald on April 11, 1945, and the Black unit in question was over 50 miles away on that date."

So the question is: is it Holocaust denial to say that the 761st Tank Division didn't liberate Buchenwald?

"No," snapped Lipstadt, "because it never happened." This, of course, brings up bigger issues about the status of the Holocaust narrative itself. Is it riddled, like AIG's portfolio, with "toxic assets?" If so, which parts of the Holocaust narrative are not true? Would it have been Holocaust denial to make

this claim when everyone, Elie Wiesel included, was effusively praising the PBS documentary? What about other parts of the Holocaust narrative, which have since gone down the memory hole? What about the lampshades made out of Jewish skin? What about the soap made from Jewish fat? What about the source of the term Holocaust itself, i.e., the truckloads of Jewish babies who were thrown into burning pits? As soon as one detail becomes patently absurd, Lipstadt is on the scene to purge it from the collective memory, to ensure that no damage gets done to the Holocaust narrative as a whole.

BIGGER ISSUE

This brings us to the bigger issue, which is, how do we know what really happened? The answer to that question is historical research, but that is precisely what the delict "holocaust denial" has been created to prevent. Holocaust denial is another word for Jewish control of discourse, in particular historical discourse, in particular historical discourse about World War II. If a historian publishes something that a powerful Jew, which is to say a Jew with powerful backers, dislikes, that person will be punished. If the person lives by writing books, as David Irving once did, the Lipstadt brigade will get him Blacklisted in the publishing industry. If the person is a professor, the big Jews will try to get him fired, as Deborah Lipstadt did in the case of Professor David O'Connell. Lipstadt failed, but David O'Connell's case is not typical in this regard.

More typical is the case of Norman Finkelstein, who was fired from his job at DePaul University in Chicago. The fact that Finkelstein was a Jew himself doesn't matter. It's the big Jews, in this case Alan Dershowitz, who decide who is to live and who is to die in academe and publishing. Finkelstein wrote a devastating critique of Dershowitz's book *The Case for Israel*, and, as a result, Dershowitz set out to destroy Finkelstein's career. It was a typically Jewish response, the academic version of "You'll never work in this town again." What followed was equally Jewish. Finkelstein characterized the dispute as a contest over "who was the toughest Jew from Borough Park." The definitive answer to that question is in: the big Jew from Borough Park is Alan Dershowitz, who got Finkelstein fired with the collaboration of the supine Catholic priest who is president of DePaul University. This also shows that a selection process is at work among Jews in academe. Any Jew who goes against the interests of organized Jewry will get destroyed by the ruthless academic enforcer Jews who represent their interests. Most Jews are immune to struggles like this because they fall into the broad, gray middle category of fellow travelers, Jews who go along with the agenda in order to collect big salaries for cushy jobs.

But there are larger lessons to be learned. First of all, when it comes to a choice between money and principle, Catholic universities go for the money. Secondly, that academe has become the site of unseemly brawls like this is

largely the result of Jewish influence in academe. As Professor Lipstadt made abundantly clear in her talk, the university is not the place where the big Jews seek the truth. The university is a place where Jews settle scores. It's where they punish people who threaten the Jewish hegemony over discourse.

The university is not a Jewish creation. It is a Catholic creation of the Catholic Middle Ages, and so it should not come as a surprise that Jews have difficulties which come with functioning in an alien environment when they are admitted to universities. For over 600 years, from roughly the beginning of the 13th to the middle of the 19th century, Catholics were involved in the creation and preservation of the university as a place where one engaged in the disinterested pursuit of the truth. This was also the place and time during which representational art reached its culmination. The link between these phenomena—art and the university as manifestations of the Logos which finds its embodiment in Christ and its cultural expression in Catholicism—is no coincidence. Conversely, the Jewish subversion of academe is similar to the Jewish subversion of the art world, something which occurred during the same period of time and, as Israel Shamir points out in a brilliant article "A Study of Art," in his book, *Caballa of Power*, for the same reasons.

Modern art is controlled by Jews. Shamir is sensitive to the sensibilities this claim offends—"'Does it matter that they are Jewish?' asks the annoyed reader"—but the facts speak for themselves:

> The Jewish influence in modern art is well attested. By 1973, some estimated that 75-80 percent of the 2500 core "art market" personnel of the United States—art dealers, art curators, art critics, and art collectors—were Jewish. In 2001, according to ARTnews, at least eight of the "Top Ten" US art collectors were Jewish: Debbie and Leon Black, Edythe and Eli Broad, Doris and Donald Fisher, Ronnie and Samuel Heyman, Marie-Josee and Henry R. Kravits, Evelyn and Leonard Lauder, Jo Carole and Ronald S. Lauder, and Stephen Wynn.
>
> "Today," wrote Gerald Krefetz in 1982, "Jews enjoy every phase of the art world: as artists, dealers, collectors, critics, curators, consultants, and patrons. In fact the contemporary art scene has a strong Jewish flavour. In some circles, the wheelers and dealers are referred to as the Jewish Mafia since they command power, prestige, and most of all money."
>
> In 1996 Jewish art historian Eunice Lipton explained that she went into a career as an art historian in order to be in a field dominated by Jews: "I wanted to be where the Jews were, that is, I wanted a profession that would allow me tacitly to acknowledge my Jewishness through the company that I kept." The field of art history was filled with Jews. At the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York, Arthur Ochs Sulzberger (former publisher of the *New York Times*) eventually became its chairman.

> He oversaw an institution in which Jews, said George Goodman, "have enriched every area of the Museum's collections . . . ."
>
> By the 1980s, four of the ten board members that dole out the MacArthur Foundation "genius awards" were also Jewish; two Jews also sat on the board of the Russell Sage Foundation. The Kaplan Fund also has had an important impact on the art community in divvying out awards. One of J. M. Kaplan's daughters was the Chairman of the New York State Arts Council. Joan Kaplan Davidson was appointed as chairman of the $34 million New York State Arts Council in 1975 despite the fact that she was "not professionally trained in the arts." The Getty Museum . . . has consistently had Jews at the economic helm. . . . [former chairman] Harold Williams . . . was "raised in a Labor Zionist home in East Los Angeles." The new president of the J. Paul Getty trust is another Jewish administrator, Barry Munitz, ...

After a summary that covers the whole spectrum of modern art, Shamir concludes nonetheless that, "The fact that Jews are so dominating in the art world is very rarely publicly acknowledged. It is forbidden-for anyone, anywhere—to discuss the subject for fear of being branded 'anti-Semitic.'"

The art world is dominated by Jews, not because they are good at producing art, but because during the course of the 20th century, Jewish ascendancy rose in America and American ascendancy rose in the world and the art world as well. As a result: "The artist as creator of art disappeared and gave place to the museum curator, the collection owner. It is he who decides what sort of junk will be displayed, whose name will be written under the photo of tinned soup or a dead rat."

Shamir is basing his verdict in this instance on a visit to the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, a Jewish creation (the architect Frank Gehry and the funders, the Guggenheim family, were Jews) which is filled with junk and, inexplicably, an exhibition of Armani suits. In this world of Jewish art, "Only the Armani brand reigns supreme, impervious to the curator's will." The Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao provides "a good place to contemplate the present decay, nay, demise of European visual art," which is now made up of "Rotten decomposed pig trunks in formalthehyde," pornography, and anything else that "became a piece of art by the decision of two Mammonites, the curator and the collector."

How did this happen? The crucial middle term in both equations (art and the university) is capitalism. The "economic freedom" of capitalism is traceable to the distinction between the Jewish prohibition on taking usury from a fellow Jew, and the permission which allowed it to be taken from "strangers." This differential first brought about a "complete transformation of commerce and industry," and then once capitalist principles became the cultural norm, other institutions (including art and academe) as well:

> The theory of price in the Talmud and the Codes in so far as it affected trade between Jew and Jew, is exactly parallel to the scholastic doctrine of *justum pretium* which was prevalent in Europe throughout the Middle Ages. But as between Jew and non-Jew, there was no just price. Price was formed, as it is today, by the "higgling of the market." . . . The differential treatment of non-Jews in Jewish commercial law resulted in the complete transformation of the idea of commerce and industry in the direction of more freedom. If we have called the Jews the Fathers of Free Trade, and therefore the pioneers of capitalism, let us note here that they were prepared for this role by the free-trading spirit of the commercial and industrial law, which received an enormous impetus towards a policy of laissez-faire by its attitude toward strangers. Clearly, intercourse with strangers could not but loosen the bonds of personal duties and replace them by economic freedom.[32]

The spirit of capitalism brought about a similar transformation of the art world and academe. Shamir calls this spirit "Mammon," which he considers

> the personification of capitalist Class Interest. A capitalist may wish to sell drinking water, but Mammon wants to poison all water in order to force everybody to buy drinking water. A capitalist may build the mall; but Mammon wants to destroy the world outside the mall, for the outside world interferes with the only meaningful occupation, shopping.

Since "Mammon will try to eliminate every distraction to shopping," the Jewish spirit which created the system of Mammon known as capitalism will "turn every kind of art into Conceptual art" because "For Mammonites, Art is a distraction from the most important occupation, adoration of Mammon. Mammonite reviews of Art concentrate on the price of Art."

Jews are never content to integrate themselves into existing structures, whether states, universities, art museums or the military. They feel compelled to infiltrate and subvert the institutions which admit them as members. In the art world, the name this Jewish infiltration and subversion goes by is "conceptual art." In an article which appeared in *The New Statesman*, Ivan Massow, then chairman of the Institute of Contemporary Arts, "noticed the damage this causes for the artists who are forced to fit into the Procrustean bed of this anti-art":

> It seems sad that so many talented young artists, clawing to be noticed for their craft, are forced to ditch their talent and reinvent themselves as creators of video installations, or a machine that produces foam in the middle of a room, in order to be recognized as contemporary artists. . . . We need art lovers to tell artists that they're not obliged to reinvent themselves into creators of piles of crap, or pass their work around like samizdat.

Deborah Lipstadt's affliction is shared by other descendants of the Cheka; shortly after those words appeared in print, Massow got sacked. Massow's expulsion from the synagogue that the British art establishment had become was, as Shamir points out,

> led by the Jewish cultural tsar Nicholas Serota, and by the Jewish art collector and advertising magnate, a friend of Pinochet, Thatcher, and Conrad Black, Charles Saatchi. His power is unique, and an art critic, Norman Rosenthal of the British Royal Academy, suggested that "the Saatchis are probably the most important collectors of modern art anywhere in the world."

Conceptual art isn't art, but it is Jewish. It signals the culmination of the Jewish take-over of modern art. Conceptual art requires no artistic ability, talent or skill. That's why Jews gravitate toward it and promote it. It's an example of Jews defining art as what they do rather than defining art in its relationship to Logos. It's as if, Shamir says, we all woke up one day and found that only cripples could compete at the Olympics. Or, to give another example, to find out that the high jump had been replaced by a chess match. Jewish domination of the art world was not "due to the great achievements of Jewish artists." Quite to the contrary, Shamir points out that

> The Jews were extremely ill-equipped for their conquest of Olympus. For many generations, Jews never entered churches and hardly ever saw paintings. They were conditioned to reject image as part of their rejection of idols. In the course of a two thousand-year-long selection process, the visual gifts of Jews were not developed, as opposed to the abilities to learn, argue, and convince, honed to perfection in the Talmudic environment.

Shamir adds that "Rejection of Christ," the Logos Incarnate who is the "main fountain of creativity," was the ultimate reason why Jews could not be artists, because

> There is no visual art or poetry outside of God; at best the godless person can imitate art. For this reason, Jews are, as a rule, poor painters and sculptors. . . . While their mastery of word and ideology is very high (well above the average of 100 at 130), their average visual ability is only 75, extremely low. One can consider it a scientific proof of "no art without Christ." Indeed, until recently there were no important Jewish painters or sculptors. The Jewish temple was supposedly built by Phoenecians and Greeks, and it had very few images. Even the Illumination of Jewish manuscripts was usually done by non-Jewish artists, who made very obvious errors trying to copy Jewish letters.

The same thing applies *mutatis mutandis* to the university. The people whose defining characteristic is rejection of Logos cannot excel in the disinterested pursuit of the truth. If they are allowed into the university they will subvert

the principles of the university and redefine academic achievement as things that Jews do well. If the university were the Olympics, chess would replace basketball. If Jews controlled the Olympics as effectively as they controlled the art world, only cripples could compete.

To disguise their lack of artistic talent, "Visually handicapped Jews created a similar anomaly—that of non-visual 'conceptual' art" because "Preparation of these items places no demand on artistic abilities. They can be done by anybody. Such art is perfectly within Jewish abilities. Moreover, Jews with their good ability to produce ideas and read iconography will surely succeed in it. Jews bend art to fit their abilities, in order for them to succeed in this difficult (for them) occupation."

The culmination of this trend to conceptualize and thereby redefine art can be found in works of "art," like "Piss Christ," an artifact which kills two birds with one stone, combining Jewish subversion of the art world with Jewish hatred of Christ. "Piss Christ" is a work of art because, as Marcel Duchamp once said, it is "in a museum." "Piss Christ" is a work of art because a museum curator said it was. In this instance, the man responsible was Leonard Lauder, the Jew who runs the Whitney Museum, a man who was, according to Shamir, "a great friend of Ariel Sharon." Are we talking about a conspiracy? Shamir lays the blame at the feet of Group Interest:

> For Jews, their Group Interest lays in undermining visual art, for they can't compete in it. The even deeper Group Interest of Jews is to undermine Christianity, their main enemy. We see this interest satisfied . . . by their relentless attack on Mel Gibson, who dared to produce a film about Christ. . . . As sacrality in Europe is unavoidably Christian, profanation of art is certainly within Jewish Group Interests. It does not mean the Jews, or even some Jews, understand that they act in their own group interest.

This is not a new phenomenon. Shamir sees the Saatchis of the world, the Jews responsible for the creation of conceptual art, as the descendants of "The Jews [who] were prominent in the great tragedy of Byzantine art, the iconoclasm. The contemporary writers leave us no doubt: Jews (a powerful community in those days as nowadays) were extremely active in promoting this concept."

The same is true *mutatis mutandis* of the university; however, I see the cause of this convergence in the form, which is to say, formal causality. The student of formal causality who attempts to deal with Jewish influence at the university is confronted with a curious philosophical phenomenon. People regularly refer to Catholics, Methodists, and Baptists (as for example, when they say 'Baylor is a Baptist university'), but the minute one refers to Jews, the term is stricken as impermissible.

The issue is philosophical, based on a philosophical error known as nominalism, which maintained that there was no such thing as "trees," only

individual birches, pines, oaks, etc. This extreme form of nominalism was noticed by Hilaire Belloc in the 1920s in his book on *The Jews*, when he wrote, "If anyone referred to a swindler as a Jew, he was an anti-Semite," but exposing the absurdity of the claim did little to stop the tendency.

In order to unravel this error at the bottom of what is in reality a ban on thought, we need to distinguish between essence and existence. If I say that a dog is a four-legged creature with fur, I am referring to essence not existence, and my claim is not refuted when someone says, "Yesterday, I saw a hairless, Mexican dog with three legs."

Similarly, the philosophical validity of the term "Catholic" or "Jew" is not refuted when someone claims "I know a Catholic who is proabortion." Or "Are you saying my Jewish mother-in-law is a revolutionary?" Both the Catholic and Jew get their identity *qua* Catholic or Jew from the form. In the case of Catholics, that form is acceptance of Christ the Logos as defined or determined by the Catholic faith, i.e., by Scripture, Tradition and the Magisterium. In the case of Jews, that form is defined by rejection of Christ and Logos, as determined by rabbinic interpretation of the Talmud. Catholics are formed by the gospels; Jews are formed by the Talmud. The result is two radically different cultures.

If the culmination of Catholic culture was the creation of the university, the culmination of Jewish culture was capitalism, which, over the course of the latter half of the 20th century in America, gradually devoured the university, by restructuring it according to capitalist, which is to say, Jewish principles, in particular those articulated by Milton Friedman and the Chicago Boys, a gang of thugs which rivals Professor Lipstadt in its brutality. The institution of tenure, a relic of the Middle Ages, was subverted and then replaced by a system in which Jewish superstar professors like Stanley Fish could earn six figure salaries (while at UIC, Stanley Fish earned more per annum than the Governor of Illinois), while the majority of the teaching was done by wage slave adjuncts.

During the more than half a millennium when Catholics were using the university to develop theology, metaphysics, physics and eventually the sciences that led to the industrial revolution, scholarship for Jews meant studying the Talmud, which meant among other things, learning how to cheat the *goyim* in business transactions and then justify those practices with a veneer of pious rationalization. This is not my opinion; it is the verdict of Heinrich Graetz, the father of Jewish historiography, who claimed in his *magnum opus* that the study of the Talmud led to the moral corruption of the Polish Jews:

> To twist a phrase out of its meaning, to use all the tricks of the clever advocate, to play upon words, and to condemn what they did not know . . . such were the characteristics of the Polish Jew. . . . Honesty and right-thinking he lost as completely as simplicity and truthfulness. He

> made himself master of all the gymnastics of the Schools and applied them to obtain advantage over any one more cunning than himself. He took delight in cheating and overreaching, which gave him a sort of joy of victory. But his own people he could not treat that way: they were as knowing as he. It was the non-Jew who, to his loss, felt the consequences of the Talmudically trained mind of the Polish Jew.

This assertion and what follows are recounted in *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and its Impact on World History Volumes I and II.* The only thing that saved Graetz himself from the fate of Polish Jews was German culture, the German Enlightenment in particular, and role models like Moses Mendelssohn and Salomon Maimon, who saw their own separation from Talmudic culture as a liberation from Jewish bondage.

And yet in spite of that liberation and the rise of the *maskilim* in the Pale of the Settlement, when the Jews were finally admitted to the university in significant numbers, as happened in Russia in the mid-19th century, they used the university as a staging ground for revolutionary activity. The same thing happened in America. In his memoir *Commies*, Ronald Radosh describes how he and other Jews in the Young Communist League were sent from New York to Wisconsin to take over the university there.

The same thing happened in slightly different fashion at Notre Dame. The main culprit was the Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, CSC. In addition to being the president who stole Notre Dame from the Catholic Church, Father Hesburgh has the distinction of hiring the first Jew at Notre Dame, Samuel Shapiro, who was brought into the history department. I knew Shapiro for the last 20 some years of his life; he would show up at my house and plunk himself down on the living room sofa periodically. I visited him in the hospital when he was dying, and I wrote his obituary after his death. In the Middle Ages Catholics were told to avoid contact with Jews because, they were told, the only time a Jew wants to talk with a Christian is to subvert his faith or corrupt his morals. For over 20 years Sam Shapiro tried to do just that. He attempted to undermine my faith—largely by trying to convert me to Darwinism—and I tried to get him to convert to Catholicism. In the end, neither project was successful. I have written about this elsewhere; the obituary can be read through *Culture Wars* magazine. For now I'd like to propose the Jewish corollary to the above statement, namely, all too often the only time a *goy* wants to talk to a Jew is when the *goy* wants big money. This was true of the princes in Medieval Europe, and it led to misery among the population at large and pogroms against the Jews, who were granted privileges that were invariably economically ruinous for the population at large in exchange for the low interest loans they provided to princes. Needless to say, this deal often included princes of the Church.

HIRED TO GET MONEY

It certainly applied to Father Hesburgh, an unofficially crowned prince of the Church, who hired Sam Shapiro to get money. Sam told me the story of the hiring more than once. He had just been fired from his job, had been jailed in Cuba, and was nervously looking forward to giving a speech to the history department in the hopes that they would hire him. When he got to Notre Dame, he realized that no speech was necessary. Father Hesburgh had passed the word to the department that Shapiro was to be hired no matter what. When he arrived at Notre Dame to begin teaching in the fall, Shapiro hardly had time to get his suitcases unpacked before he was sent to the Ford Foundation to ask for money. The message Hesburgh wanted to send was clear: Notre Dame was liberal enough for Ford money because it hired Jews.

Privately, however, Hesburgh knew that there were risks involved. As an ardent devotee of everything Harvard did and stood for (the crowning moment in Hesburgh's career was his being named to the Harvard Board of Overseers), Hesburgh must have been aware that Harvard had strict quotas that limited the number of Jews who got admitted. There is some indication that Hesburgh not only knew this, but that he also agreed with why Harvard imposed quotas on Jews because he told Ralph McInerny 'if you let the Jews in, they take over.'

For once Father Hesburgh was prescient, because this is what has happened at Notre Dame and academe in general, as the rise of a "renowned historian" like Deborah Lipstadt shows. Over the course of the 40 years after Sam Shapiro was hired, Jews were hired in increasing numbers at Notre Dame. Like Deborah Lipstadt, the Jews at Notre Dame make up for their lack of scholarship by their zeal in thought control. A few instances should make this clear.

I was once invited by the Orestes Brownson group, a conservative Catholic organization on campus, to speak on Jan Zizka and the Hussites. When the date of the talk approached I started getting concerned phone calls from the student who was the organization's president informing me that the organization had mysteriously run out of money and couldn't pay me for my talk. After assuring him that the Orestes Brownson society could pay me out of next year's budget (which they never did), I showed up to give my talk and discovered the real reason for the phone calls, namely, Professor Elliot Barkey, the Jewish professor who was the faculty moderator for this organization. Why was a Jewish professor the moderator for the conservative Catholic organization on campus? Well, because you can take the Jew out of the Cheka, but you can't take the Cheka out of the Jew. Barkey had put pressure on the student to have me canceled, and when that failed he decided to show up for my talk. His silence during the talk continued during the question and answer period afterward. Then after everyone had left the room,

he dragged the student moderator back into the room and behind closed doors claimed that I had my facts wrong and was an anti-Semite. I was reminded of Josef Pfefferkorn, zealous Jewish convert in Germany who ran afoul of Reuchlin and the humanists, and his lament, "A fat Jew has sat on my books!" Barkey sat silent during my entire talk and the question and answer period afterward. If he knew of any factual errors in my talk he could have pointed them out, and we could have discussed them in the open forum that academe is supposed to be. But instead the inner Jew triumphed and Barkey reverted to type and attacked me behind closed doors by picking on an undergraduate who knew even less about the Hussites than Barkey himself.

If this were an isolated incident, we could ascribe it to defective personalities, but the pattern is too big to ignore. The main problem is that, ultimately, the university, like the fine arts academy, is not a Jewish institution, and Jews can only thrive there if they redefine what goes on there to suit their Talmudic proclivities. The converse of this would be money-lending, where Christians, as in the case of the Calvinists in Holland and Geneva, could only succeed by imitating Jews. As a result of this mismatch, academe became a jungle in which the ruthless Jews drove out professors of principle, including other Jews who refused to go along with the agenda of organized Jewry. Jews have been formed by centuries of Talmudic influence to see academe as a place when they can settle ancestral scores. They don't get mad; they get even. Their attempt to have Professor Kevin MacDonald ousted from his position at California State University at Long Beach is one more instance of the same tendency to turn academe into an institution where the main point is settling scores, not the disinterested pursuit of the truth.

The best example of this at Notre Dame was the late Rabbi Michael Signer, the man who was "looking down on all of us" during Deborah Lipstadt's talk. I have already written about Rabbi Signer while he was alive, and there is no need to go into his all but complete lack of scholarly activity now that he is dead.

He did, however, come to mind when Deborah Lipstadt mentioned the joy Jews take in humiliating those who disagree with them. Signer was subtler than Lipstadt. He would do things like invite Polish bishops to come to Notre Dame to comment on books like Jan Gross's book *Neighbors*, which defamed the Polish nation by fabricating a Holocaust narrative out of the incident at Jedwabne. Again, see *Culture Wars*, for Iwo Pogonowski's version of what really happened.) Signer hoped that he could get the bishop to denounce Poles as anti-Semites. That is why Signer invited him. I was there in the room when he expressed his disappointment that that hadn't happened. Shortly after that exchange someone came up to me and shook his fist in my face and said, "Show more respect" because I had asked the bishop about his views on the Jewish attempt to extort reparations payments from the Poles.

Signer's aggression against the Church came out in the courses he taught on the Gospel of St. John. Students came away from his course convinced that St. John was an anti-Semite, but his main accomplishment always remained his ability to schmoose Catholics under the guise of dialogue. He was a master of reading crowds, something that came out when he organized a symposium on Mel Gibson's *Passion of the Christ*, keying up Jesuits or fellow Jews from the film department, depending on how the mood of the crowd was developing.

As a follow-up to my question about the 761st tank battalion, I asked if questioning Elie Wiesel were a form of holocaust denial. At the back of my mind was the following passage in *The Holocaust Industry*, "And to suggest that Wiesel has profited from the *Holocaust Industry*, or even to question him, amounts to Holocaust denial"[33] I did not have the book in front of me and remembered the note which followed the passage as referring to Lipstadt's book. I was wrong. The previous note referred to her book. Instead of viewing the exchange as a way of getting to the truth, Lipstadt and her handler congratulated themselves afterward on having scored another victory over another hapless *goy* holocaust denier. I know this because a student approached them in the middle of that conversation and relayed the details to me later.

What followed was more interesting. Obviously affected by the Obama invitation and the brouhaha that it was causing on campus, the student then asked Professor Lipstadt whether she thought abortion was a Holocaust. The question elicited scorn. Lipstadt dismissed it as absurd, and went on to claim that abortion was a good thing, and cited the UN's promotion of it as proof of its goodness. Suddenly UN resolutions weren't so bad after all.

The student then brought up Professor O'Connell's article on Elie Wiesel, but before she could get her question out, Lipstadt dismissed O'Connell as "third rate," and wanted to know how she had come across the article. "My professor assigned it in class," replied the student. Professor Lipstadt could no longer restrain the inner Cheka interrogator and demanded to know the professor's name, which the student was smart enough to withhold. One can imagine Professor Lipstadt poring over university course lists until 4:42 in the morning trying to find the offending professor. As in the case of Professor Barkey, you can take the Jew out of the Cheka, but you can't take the Cheka out of the Jew.

In looking at the pictures of Professor Lipstadt on the web, I couldn't help but notice that they looked nothing like the lady who spoke at Notre Dame. The photos show a woman with dark straight hair; the woman who spoke at Notre Dame had red curly hair. The discrepancy brought to mind an article I had just read, that day, on Miklos Gruner and his odd relationship with Elie Wiesel.[34] Gruner was a Hungarian Jew who was arrested and deported to Auschwitz in May of 1944. When he got to Auschwitz, Gruner met another Jew by the name of Lazar Wiesel, who had the number A-7713 tattooed on his arm. In 1986, Gruner, who was living in Australia, was contacted by a Swedish

journalist who invited him to come to Sweden to meet "an old friend" by the name of Elie Wiesel. Thinking he was going to meet his old friend Lazar, Gruner was shocked when the man who now goes by the name of Elie Wiesel met him at the airport.

> I was stunned to see a man I didn't recognize at all, who didn't even speak Hungarian and who was speaking English with a strong French accent so our meeting was over in about ten minutes. As a good-bye gift, the man gave me a book titled *Night*, of which he claimed to be the author. I told everyone there, that this man was not the person he pretended to be.

When Gruner asked to see the tattoo on Wiesel's arm, Wiesel refused, claiming that "he didn't want to exhibit his body." Once the shock wore off, Gruner resolved that "The world must know that Elie Wiesel is an imposter, and I am going to tell it." Gruner even "officially reported to the FBI that Elie Wiesel is an imposter but had no answer . . . ."

Perhaps it was the after-effect of reading this story, perhaps it was the light in the room, but after much pondering, I was forced to conclude that the real Professor Lipstadt has been kidnapped by neo-Nazis and is now being held in a basement in Potsdam near Hitler's bunker. These same neo-Nazis have obviously put an imposter in the place of "the nice Jewish girl" (her description of herself) who grew up in New York and attended City College.

I say this in all seriousness because I can't imagine why any Jewish organization would fund someone as dull-witted, mean-spirited, vindictive, and hate-filled as Professor Lipstadt to be their emissary. Why would they promote a woman who makes Heinrich Himmler seem warm and sympathetic by comparison? There is only one cogent answer to the question of *cui bono*, and that is that the imposter Professor Lipstadt must have been put in place by Neo-Nazis or skinheads or some other group interested in promoting the spread of anti-Semitism. No one promotes the spread of anti-Semitism better than Professor Lipstadt. I noticed a significant "uptick" the minute she opened her mouth. Professor Lipstadt combines the *chutzpah* of Alan Dershowitz with the scholarly acumen of Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, all in one package. Professor Lipstadt gives new meaning to the term "toxic asset." Could Goebbels have come up with a better caricature of the obnoxious Jew? No one, not even Israeli soldiers dropping white phosphorus on Palestinian women and children in Gaza, proves more conclusively that the main source of anti-Semitism in the world today is Jewish behavior.

There is, of course, one other possibility, and that is that Professor Lipstadt (or the Neo-Nazi-funded imposter who is now going around using her name) is not a commissar. She is, in fact, an *agent provocateur*. The imposter Professor Lipstadt's job is to provoke anti-Semitism. In this Professor Lipstadt is like the arsonist in the fire department. She gets to rush in and put out the fires which she herself created.

I don't want to press this issue farther than prudence allows, but there is also evidence linking Deborah Lipstadt and Notre Dame President John Jenkins in this regard. In fact there is every bit as much evidence that the real Johnny Jenkins has been kidnapped and that an imposter has been installed as president of Notre Dame. The same arguments apply. Once again, I ask, "*cui bono*?" Can anyone in his right mind believe that a Holy Cross priest who had a reputation as a conservative Thomist in the philosophy department would, as one of his first acts, approve performances of an obscene piece of agitprop like *The Vagina Monologues* in the name of academic freedom? No, the very idea is so preposterous it makes all but certain my claim that the real Johnny Jenkins has been kidnapped and some ADL agent put in his place to make the Catholic Church look supine and ridiculous. Still not convinced? Well, as an example of the one play that would get banned at Notre Dame, Jenkins (or, more likely, the Jewish ADL imposter who took his place) listed the Oberammergau Passion Play! Who but a covert agent of the ADL could come up with something more calculated to make Catholics look like idiots?!

Ultimately, there is no mystery about why Notre Dame should be interested in simultaneously inviting both Deborah Lipstadt and Barack Obama to speak. The Lipstadt redaction of the Holocaust lets every other promoter of murder off the hook. If the Holocaust is *sui generis*, then Obama's promotion of the abortion holocaust is no big deal. There is no abortion holocaust. Her presence allows Father Jenkins to be the converse of the people who talk about dead babies in America and Ukrainians who got starved to death by the Jew Lazar Kaganovich and his henchmen. It allows him to become a Holocaust denier in good standing, which is to say in good standing with the Jews, the only people whose opinion matters at Notre Dame.

BISHOP WILLIAMSON AT THE END OF HIS TETHER

When the Eye of Sauron that goes by the name of mass communication first fastened its fiery gaze on Bishop Richard Williamson in the wake of the pope's attempt to bring the Society of St. Pius X back into communion with the Church by lifting the excommunications that followed *latae sententiae* from the act that made Williamson a bishop, his excellency was living in Argentina, where he was rector of one of the society's seminaries. He later moved to Wimbledon, England, home of the famous tennis tournament. If home is the place that has to take you in when no one else wants you, it's clear that the SSPX headquarters on Arthur Road was his home. The lifting of the excommunications as a prelude to healing the schism gave birth to the hope that Bishop Williamson might find a home in the Church again, but, as I approached Wimbledon, the signals were mixed. The lifting of the excommunications signaled the start of negotiations, but the signals emanating from the negotiations were also mixed. Walter Cardinal Kasper announced

a few days before my arrival that the negotiations were going nowhere; indications from the other side were equally gloomy. Bishop Fellay, another of the four bishops, had been interviewed at the SSPX seminary in Winona, Minnesota and the interview had been posted on YouTube. Fellay began the interview by throwing Williamson under the bus, and it went downhill from there. "The Church has cancer," Bishop Fellay opined, "and if we embrace the Church we'll get cancer." He went on to say that the SSPX reserved the right to consecrate other bishops if the negotiations turned out to be unsatisfactory. Hope for unity seemed a long way off as I gazed at the preparations for the Wimbledon tennis tournament from a passing train. The fields surrounding Wimbledon were full of people, many of whom were pitching tents on this blazingly hot day in late June.

The hubbub surrounding the tennis match seemed particularly distant because a Ugandan by the name of Jasper was shouting the Letter to the Hebrews into my ear above the din of the train. Jasper began the conversation by informing me that he used to be a Catholic. He was, in fact, a seminarian, until he was captured by the Ugandan revolutionary movement known as The Lord's Army and marched off to God knows where. As Ugandan armies go, the Lord's Army was probably not as bad as the army of Idi Amin, which murdered hundreds of thousands of Ugandans and dumped them into the Nile. There were so many corpses in the water that even the crocodiles couldn't eat them all. As a result, they began clogging the intake pipes of the local power plant. So being a captive of the Lord's Army wasn't as bad as the situation a few years before, but it was no picnic either. Jasper and his fellow captives were marching somewhere or other when they ran into the current regime's army, the successors of Idi Amin, at which point a firefight ensued and Jasper was wounded in the leg.

He paused in his autobiographical narrative to reach down and pull up the left leg of his trousers to reveal a number of coin size scars on his chocolate-brown leg.

"That's where the bullets entered my leg," he says.

Everyone in the train stopped what they are doing and took a look at his leg. Then they gazed away and went back to their newspapers or gazed off into space listening to their I-pods. Jasper went back to reading the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, pausing for emphasis to read "and remember always to welcome strangers, for by doing this some people have entertained angels without knowing it." Jasper clearly feels that this passage has some special relevance to our situation.

The scripture passage gets caught on a branch of my consciousness like a valuable article of clothing being washed downstream in the torrent of words which has been spouting from Jasper's mouth ever since I suggested that he rejoin the Church. Everyone, it seems, is a spiritual Robinson Crusoe these days, willfully marooning himself on a spiritual island of his own choosing

and declaring himself his own pope. I try hard to concentrate on what he is saying, especially when he refers our present encounter to the angel quote in Hebrews, but I can't figure out whether I'm supposed to be the angel to him or he the angel to me.

"You need faith," he tells me.

"No," I reply, half wondering what the London commuters are making of our conversation. "I have faith. You need the Church." My reply unleashes another torrent of Bible verses of the sort I have heard more than once from ardent fundamentalists in America. When I bring up, "You are Peter and upon this rock I will build my church and the gates of Hell will not prevail against it," Jasper goes etymological on me, claiming that "*ecclesia*" means "assembly," which is true enough, and that therefore any assembly which proclaims the word of God is the Church.

"You and I are church," Jasper tells me earnestly, omitting the definite article like someone in the liturgy program at Notre Dame.

"No, we're not," I reply. "I am a member of the Church and you are an ex-member, and that's the point of this whole discussion."

This too elicits another torrent of Scripture, which pours forth from his mouth like the flood-swollen river in Brazil which I saw the night before on the BBC. The theological equivalent of refrigerators, cars, hen houses, etc., sweep past my ears as I try to assess the theological significance of it all. This must be happening for a reason, I keep telling myself, but all I can say to Jasper is, "You're not listening to what I'm saying," which, of course, releases another torrent of scriptural passages, which would still be pouring forth as I write this if the train hadn't arrived at Wimbledon Park station, where I disembarked.

During our conversation, I told Jasper that I was going to give a talk on the priest sex abuse crisis in Ireland. The image this conjures in Jasper's mind mutates over the course of our train ride together into a scene in which he envisions me arriving in a house full of pedophile priests with nothing more in my spiritual arsenal than the talk I've prepared to defend myself. It's clear he doesn't think much of giving talks. He urges me instead to cast out demons in the name of Our Lord Jesus Christ. For a moment I consider taking him at his ill-informed word. Pedophilia, schism, whatever: chuck the talk and drive out the demons with a command. The idea would recur to me throughout the day.

When I got to St. George's House on Arthur Road, the headquarters of the SSPX in England, Bishop Williamson greeted me at the door. It's been roughly ten years since we last met in person at the SSPX seminary in Winona, Minnesota, where I gave a talk to the seminarians on horror movies. This time the conversation was more focused on the situation in the Church. After the initial pleasantries, his excellency informed me that, as a result of the media circus of 2009, he had been stripped of all assignments in the SSPX.

This comes as no surprise because I had seen the Bishop Fellay interview on YouTube. So, after being expelled from Argentina, Bishop Williamson returned to England, where he now resides, all dressed up with no place to go. Whatever hopes the lifting of the excommunications in January 2009 engendered were superceded by the uproar surrounding the media lynch mob which attempted to derail any reunification of the Society and the Church by bringing up Holocaust denial. The waves of that storm have subsided, but it looks as if the chances of reconciliation have subsided with them.

As I mentioned, shortly before I arrived in England, Walter Cardinal Kasper announced that Rome's negotiations with the SSPX were not going well. Writing on the Chiesa.com website,[35] Sandro Magister wrote that Kasper's misgivings were amplified in an article written by Eberhard Schockenhoff, one of Kasper's former students, and now professor of moral theology at the University of Freiburg. The article appeared in the April 2010 issue of the German Jesuit magazine *Stimmen der Zeit*, and in it Schockenhoff claimed "that the real disagreement between the Church of Rome and the Lefebvrists does not concern the Mass in Latin, but the teaching of Vatican II, especially on ecclesiology and on freedom of conscience and religion." Both Schockendorf and Kasper fear that the readmission of the SSPX will doom their interpretation of Vatican II and all of the projects of the past forty-some years which have been based on it. Schockenhoff fears that "exegetical manipulation of the conciliar texts" will allow both Rome and the SSPX to marginalize the true meaning of the council by misrepresenting what Schockenhoff and presumably Kasper consider genuine reforms as postconciliar misunderstandings and aborted experiments. This would allow an "antimodern protest movement based on preconciliar Catholicism" to be smuggled into the Church. It would also mark the end (although Schockenhoff doesn't say this) of the hegemony of the German professors, whose interpretation has been dominant but fading since the end of the Council. The influence of the German professors has faded even more, paradoxically, since the accession of Benedict XVI (the quintessential German professor) to the chair of Peter. Schockenhoff compares the negotiations with the SSPX to "a hermeneutic tightrope walk, which attempts to square the circle." He also compares it to "playing with fire."[36] The issue is interpretation: Whose interpretation of the Council is going to prevail? Put another way, readmitting the SSPX would mean the end of the hegemony of the German professors' interpretation of the council, which the German professors like to portray as "the will of the majority of the Council fathers":

> By proposing an official interpretation, another meaning gets imposed on central conciliar texts other than the meaning which the will of the majority of the Council fathers intended. . . . What's at stake here is the direction of the future path of the Church, a direction which the Council

> chose when it decided to open itself up to the modern world, when it chose ecumenical solidarity with the orthodox and reformation churches as well as dialogue with the Jews and other world religions.[37]

The main person responsible for wanting to "square the circle," i.e., make the Council documents compatible with both modernity and tradition is, in Schockenhoff's view, Pope Benedict XVI. Magister claims that "In explaining how to interpret the Council correctly, Benedict XVI shows how it did in fact introduce new developments with respect to the past, but always in continuity with 'the deepest patrimony of the Church.'" And as an example of this interplay between newness and continuity, the pope illustrates precisely the conciliar ideas on freedom of religion: the main point of division between the Church and the Lefebvrists."

On December 22, 2005, Pope Benedict gave a speech to the curia in which he tried to explain the *zeitgeist* regnant when the Council was in session:

> The Council had to find a new definition of the relationship between the Church and the modern age. This relationship started out difficultly with the Galileo trial. It broke completely, when Kant defined "religion within pure reason" and when, in the radical phase of the French Revolution, an image of the state and of man was spread that practically intended to crowd out the Church and faith. The clash of the Church's faith with a radical liberalism and also with natural sciences that claimed to embrace, with its knowledge, the totality of reality to its outmost borders, stubbornly setting itself to make the "hypothesis of God" superfluous, had provoked in the 19th century under Pius IX, on the part of the Church, a harsh and radical condemnation of this spirit of the modern age. Thus, there were apparently no grounds for any positive and fruitful agreement, and drastic were also the refusals on the part of those who felt they were the representatives of the modern age.
>
> However, in the meantime, the modern age also had its development. It was becoming clear that the American Revolution had offered a model of the modern state that was different from that theorized by the radical tendencies that had emerged from the second phase of the French Revolution. Natural sciences began, in a more and more clear way, to reflect their own limits, imposed by their own method which, though achieving great things, was nevertheless not able to comprehend the totality of reality. Thus, both sides began to progressively open up to each other. In the period between the two world wars and even more after the second world war, Catholic statesmen had shown that a modern lay state can exist, which nevertheless is not neutral with respect to values, but lives tapping into the great ethical fonts of Christianity. Catholic social doctrine, as it developed, had become an important model between radical liberalism and the Marxist theory of the state.

As a result of this opening to the modern world, discontinuities began to emerge. Catholics began condemning things that the saints of previous eras considered praiseworthy. Similarly, things that the Council considered praiseworthy—things like Schockenhoff's "dialogue with the Jews"—would have been condemned as pernicious by Church Fathers like St. John Chrysosotm. Before long the discontinuities became too big and too important to ignore, or as Pope Benedict put it:

> It is clear that in all these sectors, which together are one problem, some discontinuities would emerge. Although this may not have been fully appreciated at first, the discontinuities that did emerge—notwithstanding distinct concrete historical situations and their needs—did prevent continuity at the level of principles.

The Church finds herself in the process of reconciling those discontinuities, and it is this process of re-establishing continuity with tradition which Schockenhoff sees as a betrayal of the meaning of the Council. The SSPX, on the other hand, sees the process of reconciliation as a betrayal of Church doctrine, and it is at precisely this impasse that the negotiations with the SSPX stand at the moment.

The pope feels that the Council succeeded at being both new and connected with the past:

> By defining in a new way the relationship between the faith of the Church and some essential elements of modern thinking, the Second Vatican Council revised and even corrected some past decisions. But in an apparent discontinuity it has instead preserved and reinforced its intimate nature and true identity. The Church is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic both before and after the Council, throughout time. It "presses forward amid the persecutions of the world and the consolations of God," announcing the cross and death of the Lord until he comes (cf *Lumen gentium*, 8).

> Yet those who expected that with this fundamental "Yes" to the modern age, all tensions would melt away, and that this "opening up to the world" would render everything harmonious, underestimated the inner tensions and contradictions of the modern age; they underestimated the internal tensions and the dangerous fragility of human nature, which have threatened man's journey throughout all historical periods and configurations. Given man's new power over himself and over matter, these dangers have not disappeared; instead, they have acquired a new dimension. We can clearly illustrate this by looking at current history.

An uncanny similarity emerges between the SSPX and the liberals who want to keep them out of the Church. Both the SSPX and Professor Schockenhoff are arguing that their interpretation of Vatican II should be taken as normative.

Both the SSPX and Professor Schockenhoff (for obviously different reasons) would claim that Pope Benedict XVI was "attempting to square the circle," by thinking that modernity and Church tradition were reconcilable. Both the SSPX and Professor Schockenhoff have made a particular interpretation of a particular council as the litmus test for membership in the Church. Neither the SSPX nor Professor Schockenhoff seems capable of entertaining the idea that the Church had embarked upon projects in the wake of the Council which were based on council documents but which went way beyond what the council documents authorized. "*Gespräch mit dem Judentum*" or dialogue with the Jews is one example cited by Schockenhoff which has led to an almost total discontinuity with the past, something the American bishops discovered when they had to revise their catechism. Should the Church perdure in this particular implementation of the Council? Or should she admit that this and other projects which the Council spawned, unlike the documents themselves, are nothing more than failed experiments based on an inadequate understanding of what was really happening during the revolutionary '60s? Is the Church committed to repudiating the Gospel in the name of dialogue? One would hope not, but the question needs to be contextualized before it can be answered. If we identify the Council with "*Gespräch mit dem Judentum*," as Professor Schockenhoff does, then the answer is far from clear. Schockenhoff might go so far as to endorse postconciliar aberrations like the claim that "the Mosaic covenant is eternally valid," a claim both made and repudiated by the American bishops, but would the pope go that far? Probably not. But Pope Benedict's track record on continuity is far from clear. He seems unaware that dialogue with the Jews, as currently practiced, entails repudiating the Gospel, and that proclaiming the Gospel is antithetical to dialogue with the Jews. The issue is far from resolved, and the only thing that unites both the German professors and the SSPX at this point seems to be their belief that the pope is determined to square the circle.

There were people within the Church who didn't want reunification to happen because it threatened their interpretation of Vatican II as the normative view. George Weigel was one of those people. "It is not easy," he wrote in an editorial in *Newsweek* in February 2009, "to see how the unity of the Catholic Church will be advanced if the Lefebvrist faction does not publicly and unambiguously affirm Vatican Council II's teaching on the nature of the Church, on religious freedom, and on the sin of anti-Semitism. Absent such an affirmation, pick-and-choose cafeteria Catholicism will be reborn on the far fringes of the Catholic right, just when it was fading into insignificance on the dwindling Catholic left, its longtime home." Having a neocon like George Weigel accuse the SSPX of "pick-and-choose cafeteria Catholicism" was a classic instance of the pot calling the kettle black. Weigel had been picking and choosing his peculiar brand of Catholicism according to neocon principles for years, beginning with his justification of the war

in Iraq through his reading of Pope Benedict XVI's encyclical on Church social teaching, *Caritas in Veritatem*. When Weigel put on his magic neocon glasses to read the pope's encyclical, some passages appeared in gold, which is to say, they were congruent with the neocon agenda, while some passages appeared in red, which meant that they were not and could safely be ignored by real Catholics, which is to say, those who followed the neocon agenda as articulated by George Weigel. To people like this, the Holocaust denial brouhaha was the answer to a maiden's prayer because it provided a way to shut down unwelcome discussion of suppressed topics. But by June 2010, the time of my meeting with Bishop Williamson, it looked as if the Holocaust issue had been resolved. In the spring of 2010 Williamson was convicted in a German court and fined 180,000 euros, a sum that was later reduced to 10,000, which he appealed. Bishop Williamson had "put that issue behind him," as the politicians like to say. He was now "ready to move on with his life."

Or was he? At the height of the media cycle, Williamson wrote to the pope and suggested that he be thrown, like Jonah, into the sea to calm the waves. That is a fairly close approximation of what happened, but it wasn't the pope who threw his excellency into the sea, it was Bishop Fellay, who threw him under the bus. Richard Williamson is now a bishop without a portfolio. In addition to removing him from the seminary in Argentina, Bishop Fellay has forbidden Williamson from saying anything in public, including presumably granting interviews to people like me.

If there was an assumption on my part behind this meeting it was that the lifting of the excommunications and the subsequent Holocaust denial brouhaha had changed the situation. The only evidence I had to go on was Williamson volunteering to be thrown into the sea, but that seemed indication enough that the situation had changed him. The lifting of the excommunications had certainly changed my attitude toward the SSPX—from accusations of the sort that we had leveled in the investigative pieces we had run in the '90s to a desire to do whatever it took to restore full communion. Actually, that desire existed long before the excommunications had been lifted. When we had met at the SSPX seminary in Winona in the '90s, I had asked his excellency what I could do to help end the schism. His reply was simple enough, "Get Rome to revoke Vatican II."

"Is that all?" I said jokingly back then.

The more we talked, however, the more I had the sinking feeling that nothing had changed. "*Semper idem*" (always the same) was the motto of Cardinal Ottaviani and the phrase had seemed appealing in dealing with the modernists, but now it began to recur in a different, less positive light, which is to say, not so much as a reaffirmation of tradition, but as the theological version of Groundhog Day, the movie in which Bill Murray plays a weatherman from Pittsburgh who repeats the same day over and over again. The SSPX had been

claiming for over 20 years that the issue was doctrine, specifically doctrinal issues concerning Vatican II, and in the wake of the excommunications, they had persuaded Rome to engage in dialogue under those auspices, but now as Cardinal Kasper had pointed out, that the dialogue was going nowhere.

This is not surprising because doctrine was never the heart of the matter. In fact, by allowing the dialogue on doctrine to proceed, Rome had fatally undermined its own position. The real issue is schism, not doctrine. Heresy is a sin against doctrine, and in the negotiations which followed the lifting of the excommunications, the SSPX was engaged in an attempt to turn the tables on Rome and convince them that they were guilty of heresy. Before entering into dialogue with the SSPX, Rome would have done better to watch Bishop Fellay's interview on YouTube. In it, Fellay gets to the heart of the matter when he says, "The Church has cancer. We don't want to embrace the Church because then we'll get cancer too."

If anyone had any doubts about the SSPX being in schism, this interview should have laid them to rest. As St. Augustine pointed out in his treatises on Baptism and the Donatists, schism has nothing to do with doctrine. Schism is a sin against charity. It involves breaking communion out of fear of contamination—which is precisely how Bishop Fellay framed the issue in his YouTube interview. Bishop Williamson has his own YouTube interview, filmed in January 2010, in which he says essentially the same thing. The only difference is that Williamson claims that the Church has leprosy. In medical terms, the analogy is more apt because leprosy is contagious, but the thought is essentially the same. The SSPX broke communion with the Church when Archbishop Lefebvre consecrated Williamson and Fellay and two other bishops. Refusal of communion out of fear of contamination is, as anyone who has read St. Augustine knows, the classic expression of schism, but evidently no one in Rome noticed this when they began negotiations with the SSPX because instead of dealing with the issue at hand, Rome embarked upon the theological equivalent of Mission Impossible, which is to say a theological discussion of the documents of Vatican II with a group of people who were using doctrine as a pretext to avoid talking about their own lack of charity.

Rome overlooked the psychological need on the part of the SSPX to divert the negotiations into a discussion of doctrine. That need is based more on guilt than anything in the documents of Vatican II. The SSPX committed a sin against charity when Archbishop Lefebvre, claiming that a state of emergency existed in the Church, broke communion by consecrating the four bishops. Their justification for breaking communion is ultimately irrelevant because the Church is always to some extent in a state of emergency because the Church is always at the mercy of the venal and wicked men who rise to positions of power in it because such men always rise to positions of power in human institutions, but no state of emergency (real or imagined) ever justifies breaking communion. The Irish priest sex abuse crisis is a case in point, and it

was the invitation to discuss that crisis in the light of tradition which brought me to the SSPX headquarters in Wimbledon.

THE PRIEST CRISIS IN IRELAND

In a pastoral letter addressed to the Church in Ireland dated March 19, 2010, Pope Benedict XIV claimed that to recover from the wound which a number of Irish priests had inflicted on the young people entrusted to their care

> the Church in Ireland must first acknowledge before the Lord and before others the serious sins committed against defenseless children. Such an acknowledgement, accompanied by sincere sorrow for the damage caused to these victims and their families, must lead to a concerted effort to ensure the protection of children from similar crimes in the future.

The pope based his letter largely on the findings of The Murphy Report, which had been published on November 26, 2009 and found that "child abuse by clerics was widespread throughout the period under review."

More crucial to a correct understanding of the Irish sexual abuse crisis is an understanding of the "period under review." Most of the cases of abuse which the Church is now confronting took place in a period whose epicenter was roughly 30 to 40 years ago. In order to understand the crisis then, we need to understand what Germans call the *Zeitgeist*, or the spirit of the times, the times being largely the '70s, when roughly ten years after the Second Vatican Council ended, the Church was in the throes of its implementation.

The pope adverts to this period in his letter:

> Significant too was the tendency during this period, also on the part of priests and religious, to adopt ways of thinking and assessing secular realities without sufficient reference to the Gospel. The programme of renewal proposed by the Second Vatican Council was sometimes misinterpreted and indeed, in the light of the profound social changes that were taking place, it was far from easy to know how best to implement it.

A main characteristic of this period, according to the pope, was

> a well-intentioned but misguided tendency to avoid penal approaches to canonically irregular situations. It is in this overall context that we must try to understand the disturbing problem of child sexual abuse, which has contributed in no small measure to the weakening of the faith and the loss of respect for the Church and her teachings.

The Murphy Report makes clear that the Church did not apply the remedies which Canon Law provides in the case of sexual abuse. Instead, the diocese of Dublin set aside the penal process of Canon Law in favor of a purely "pastoral" approach which was, in the Commission's view, "wholly ineffective as a means of controlling clerical child sexual abuse." During the course of its investigations, the Commission learned that "In the mid 1970s there

was no public, professional or Government perception either in Ireland or internationally that child sexual abuse constituted a societal problem or was a major risk to children." As one commentator put it:

> The pages of the Murphy Report are littered with instances of carelessness, incompetence and moral cowardice. Over the past fifteen to twenty years they have been flailing about, trying to get to grips with a seemingly intractable problem. Far too often their response has been, at best, inadequate. A line from the Report which rings particularly true refers to a priest who had the impression of Archbishop Connell that he "came across as someone who really cared for the victim but had not 'got a clue' about how to go about dealing with the reality of the problem." Many of the other Bishops give a similar impression.

> Pope Benedict was unsparing in his criticism of the priests who betrayed the trust of those whom they were called to serve and the bishops who were derelict in exercising proper oversight, but Paragraph 4 of his pastoral letter indicates that other forces were at work as well.

> In recent decades the Church in your country has had to confront new and serious challenges to the faith arising from the rapid transformation and secularization of Irish society. Fast-paced social change has occurred, often adversely affecting people's traditional adherence to Catholic teaching and values. All too often, the sacramental and devotional practices that sustain faith and enable it to grow, such as frequent confession, daily prayer and annual retreats were neglected. Only by examining carefully the many elements that gave rise to the present crisis can a clear-sighted diagnosis of its causes be undertaken and effective remedies be found.

Commenting on the pope's letter in a symposium at Chiesa.com,[38] Sandro Magister claimed that "Benedict XVI has given the Catholics of Ireland an order never before given by a pope of the modern era to an entire national Church. . . . He told them not only to bring the guilty before the canonical and civil courts, but to put themselves collectively in a state of penance and purification . . . in a public form, before the eyes of all, even the most implacable and mocking adversaries," but the point of the article was, once again the *Zeitgeist*. As the title of another Magister article indicated, "Genesis of Crime: the Revolution of the 1960s," the cause of this crime was the sexual revolution of the '60s, which was a true revolution and which brought about the sexualization of traditional Catholic cultures, which brought with it the sexualization of the clergy.

In the same symposium, Angelo Cardinal Bagnasco saw "strategies of generalized discredit" behind the news reports as well as more than a little hypocrisy. The media calling for the pope's resignation were the same media which had spent decades undermining sexual morality:

> In reality, we must all question ourselves, without any more alibis, about a culture that in our time reigns pampered and uncontested, and tends progressively to fray the connective tissue of society as a whole, perhaps even mocking those who try to resist and to oppose it: the attitude that is, of those who cultivate absolute autonomy from the criteria of moral judgment and convey as good and alluring behaviors that are designed according to individual desires and even unbridled instincts. But the exaggeration of sexuality disconnected from its anthropological significance, all-encompassing hedonism, and a relativism that does not admit limits or exceptions, do great harm because they are specious and sometimes so pervasive as to escape notice.

Cardinal Ruini called the crisis in Ireland "part of a strategy that has been underway for centuries" and claimed that the German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche had "elaborated" this strategy "with his flair for detail."

> According to Nietzsche, the decisive attack on Christianity cannot be brought on the level of truth, but on that of Christian ethics, which he saw as the enemy of the joy of living. And so I would like to ask those who decry scandals of pedophilia mostly when they involve the Catholic Church, perhaps bringing into question priestly celibacy: would it not be more honest and realistic to recognize that certainly these and other deviations related to sexuality accompany the entire history of the human race, but also that in our time these deviations are further stimulated by the much ballyhooed 'sexual liberation."

> When the exaltation of sexuality pervades every part of life and when autonomy from any moral criterion is claimed for the sexual instinct, it becomes difficult to explain that certain abuses are absolutely to be condemned. In reality, human sexuality from the start is not simply instinctual; it is not the same as that of the other animals. It is, like all of man, a sexuality 'mixed' with reason and morality, which can be lived humanly, and truly bring happiness, only if it is lived this way.

Once again the key to understanding the Irish abuse crisis is understanding "the period under review," which is the aftermath of the sexual revolution of the '60s. Professor of sociology Massimo Introvigne, president of CESNUR, the Center for the Studies on New Religion, claimed that the attack on the Church began in earnest during "what the English and the Americans call 'the '60s,' and the Italians, concentrating on the emblematic year of 1968 [call] '*il Sessantotto.*'" This era, according to Professor Introvigne, "increasingly appears as a time of profound disturbances of customs, with crucial and lasting effects on religion."

Benedict XVI in his letter shows that he is aware that there was in the 1960s an authentic revolution—no less important than the Protestant Reformation

or the French Revolution—that was "fast-paced" and dealt a tremendous blow to "traditional adherence to Catholic teaching and values."

> In the Catholic Church there was not at once a sufficient awareness of the scope of this revolution. In this climate, certainly not all priests who were insufficiently formed or infected by the climate following the '60s and not even a significant percentage of them, became pedophiles. But the study of the revolution of the 1960s and of 1968 is crucial to understanding what happened afterward, including pedophilia. And to finding real remedies. If this revolution, unlike those before it, is moral and spiritual and touches the interiority of man, it is only from the restoration of morality of the spiritual life and of comprehensive truth about the human person that the remedies can ultimately come.

Talking about the '60s and understanding the '60s are two different things. What all of the critiques have in common is an inadequate understanding of what happened in the '60s and, more importantly, what happened in the aftermath of the sexual revolution, a period which coincided with the implementation of the Second Vatican Council.

Cardinal Ruini mentions Nietzsche, who is certainly a villain, but if his eminence was interested in talking about a campaign of revolution, of "a strategy that has been underway for centuries," and sexualization of the culture for political purposes, he would have done better to begin with the Marquis de Sade.

Similarly, Professor Introvigne claims

> that a single factor cannot explain a revolution of this magnitude. The economic boom and feminism play a part, but also more strictly cultural aspects both outside the churches and Christian communities (the encounter between psychoanalysis and Marxism) and inside them (the 'new theologies').

But he doesn't mention Wilhelm Reich, the man who created the term Sexual Revolution and who also combined psychoanalysis and Marxism to create a weapon specifically targeted against the Catholic Church, and even more specifically one which promoted the sexual corruption of the clergy as the best way of reducing the Church's political power.

Reich was a Jew from Galicia, the easternmost province of the Austro-Hungarian empire, who was both a Freudian and a Marxist. Nine years after his death, he became the hero of the '68 revolution in Paris. Two years later he was featured on the cover of the *New York Times* magazine.

By the time Reich had been re-discovered by the New Left in 1969, he had been dead for ten years, but that was irrelevant, because the Reich the cultural revolutionaries were interested in promoting had stopped writing in 1933. On January 4, 1971, Christopher Lehmann-Haupt wrote a review of the new Farrar Straus edition of *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, which announced

in effect that the Reich revival had begun in earnest. "Wilhelm Reich," Lehmann-Haupt proclaimed, "the Austrian sexologist and inventor of the so-called orgone energy accumulator, has made a comeback." Reich, according to the review, was the father of youth culture, the sexual revolution, and the feminist movement. Kate Millett's book *Sexual Politics* was written under his influence. Beyond that, Reich was better at reconciling Freud and Marx than Marcuse, especially by expounding his "credo that sexual man was man liberated from his need for authority, religion, and marriage." Reich, in other words, "makes considerable sense," at least to someone sympathetic to the goal of sexual liberation. Lehmann-Haupt was so enamored of Reich's vision of sexual liberation he was even willing to take a second look at his theory of orgone energy. "Perhaps it's time to reconsider all of Wilhelm Reich," he concluded.

Four months later, on April 18, 1971, the *New York Times* returned to Reich, this time devoting a feature length article in the Sunday magazine to his thought. In "Wilhelm Reich: The Psychiatrist as Revolutionary," David Elkind described how student communards in Berlin pelted the police with soft-bound copies of Reich's *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*. (Was it compassion that kept them from using hardbound copies or frugality?) Reich "was being resurrected everywhere in Europe as a hero/saint to students demanding social reform," and "many American young people" were "now discovering that Reich is very much their kind of Revolutionary too." This was because his message was more appealing to the American Left, who felt that they could bring down the state by sexual license without the sublimation urged by Freud or the political revolution urged by Marx.

Reich is relevant to our discussion because he was a proponent of both child sexuality and the sexual subversion of the clergy. In *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, Reich claimed that it was pointless to debate the existence of God with a seminarian. However, if the seminarian could be induced to engage in sexual activity, the idea of God "evaporated" from his mind. In *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, Reich praised "the genuine sociologist who will reckon psychoanalysis' comprehension of childhood sexuality as a highly significant revolutionary act."[39] He says that the Catholic Church is the main enemy of revolutionary liberation:

> With the restriction and suppression of sexuality, the nature of human feeling changes; a sex-negating religion comes into being and gradually develops its own sex-political organization, the church with all its predecessors, the aim of which is nothing other than the eradication of man's sexual desires and consequently of what little happiness there is on earth.

According to Reich: "Sexual inhibition prevents the average adolescent from thinking and feeling in a rational way." Religion, according to Reich, is nothing more than inhibited sexuality:

> Clinical experience shows incontestably that religious sentiments result from inhibited sexuality, that the source of mystical excitation is to be sought in inhibited sexual excitation. The inescapable conclusion of all this is that a clear sexual consciousness and a natural regulation of sexual life must foredoom every form of mysticism; that, in other words, natural sexuality is the archenemy of mystical religion. By carrying on an anti-sexual fight wherever it can, making it the core of its dogmas and putting it in the foreground of its mass propaganda, the church only attests to the correctness of this interpretation.[40]

Reich claims that: "If one succeeds in getting rid of the childhood fear of masturbation and as a result thereof genitality demands gratification, then intellectual insight and sexual gratification are wont to prevail."[41]

The first step to revolution is the promotion of child sexuality because "Sexual consciousness and mystical sentiments cannot coexist." Any revolutionary who regards sexuality as a "private matter" is guilty of a "grave error" because

> political reaction . . . always rides on two tracks at the same time: on that of *economic policies* and that of "*moral renewal.*" Until now, the freedom movement has traveled on one track only. What is needed, therefore, is to master the sexual question on a social scale, to transform the shadowy side of personal life into social mental hygiene, to make the sexual question a part of the total campaign, instead of confining oneself to the question of population politics.[42]

Sexual revolution is, to use Reich's term, "social dynamite," but it cannot work its destructive havoc if the revolutionaries are afraid of getting involved in child sexuality, or as Reich puts it: "if this work is to be carried out by revolutionaries who vie with the church in the asseveration and advocacy of moralistic mysticism, who view the answering of the sexual question as being beneath the 'dignity of revolutionary ideology,' who dismiss childhood masturbation as a 'bourgeois invention,'" it won't work.

In other words the true revolutionary must be willing to promote the sexualization of children. The revolutionary, according to Reich, must "awaken . . . a desire in modern youth, a desire for a new philosophy and for scientific knowledge about the fight for sexual health, sexual consciousness, and freedom. . . . It is the youth that matters! And they—this much is certain—are no longer accessible to a sex-negating ideology on a mass scale. This is our strong point."[43]

Reich's emphasis on the promotion of sexual activity is too pervasive to be ignored:

> *In the main, revolutionary work with children can only be sex-economic work.* Overcome your astonishment and listen patiently. Why is it that children in the pre-pubertal stage can be directed by sexual education in the best and easiest way?[44]

> This powerful weapon was never put to use in Germany. And it was those in charge of child organizations who offered the strongest resistance to the proposal that the usual individual treatment of sex education be turned into sex education on a mass scale.[45]

> If we could once succeed in engaging the sexual interests of children and adolescents on a mass scale, then reactionary contamination would be faced with a tremendous counterforce – and political reaction would be powerless.[46]

> . . . the mechanism that makes masses of people incapable of freedom is the social suppression of genital sexuality in small children, adolescents, and adults.[47]

To bring about revolution, the true revolutionary, according to Reich, must promote sex with children. He must also promote the sexualization of the Catholic clergy because the Catholic Church is the main obstacle to the revolutionary take-over of Austrian society:

> The case of clerics is especially difficult, for a convincing continuation of their profession, whose physical consequences they have felt on their own body, has become impossible. The only course open to many of them is to replace their priesthood with religious research or teaching.

Taken together Reich's promotion of child sexuality and the sexualization of the Catholic clergy became the blueprint for the subversion of the Catholic Church. This campaign began in the wake of the Second Vatican Council but it reached its culmination in the priest abuse crisis of the first decade of the 21st century. Reich's theories were put into practice during the sexual revolution of the '60s, but it would take decades before their full effect would be felt.

The Left put Reich's theories into practice during the '60s. In an article which appeared in the Austrian magazine *Die Aula* in February 2001, a translation of which was reprinted in English in *Culture Wars* in May of that year,[48] Hans Fingeller explained how the sexual revolutionaries "used children as experimental guinea pigs in the sensitive area of sexual development":

> Wilhelm Reich, a wacko follower of Sigmund Freud, proposed certain theses on how one might "liberate" the sexuality of children, which the "Spontis" and APO [Ausserparliamentarische Opposition] revolutionaries used as an excuse to carry out certain experiments with children. . . . As a result of absorbing Reich's theories, the '68 generation began

> experimenting on their own children, who were now being raised not in pubic or religious schools, but rather in "alternative day care centers" in which zealous comrades attempted to create out of this "human material" the "New Man" not by any biological process but by the deliberate application of Marxist ideology to the classroom.

In his book *Linke Lebensluegen: eine Ueberfaellige Rechnung* (Left-wing Lies about Life: a long-overdue Reckoning) Klaus Rainer Roehl, who was then husband of RAF terrorist Ulrike Meinhof, goes into detail about the child-rearing practices in Kommune 2, which specialized in raising children according to the Gospel of Wilhelm Reich.

The first goal of this "education" was to replace the attachment of the child to his parents with a relationship to a "relationship person" and as a result inhibit the formation of "the authoritarian family fixation." These activities included pedophilic contact between adults and five year old girls, the details of which I will spare you. You can read the full account in the May 2001 issue of *Culture Wars*.

Daniel Cohn-Bendit became a member of the European Parliament and the head of the Green Party in France, but during the '60s he was a teacher in one of these day-care centers. After his Comrade-in-Arms Joschka Fischer was named foreign minister of Germany, Cohn-Bendit granted an interview with ZDF, the second German TV channel, in which he was asked whether he was ever employed in one of the red day care centers.

"Yes, of course, of course," he replied.

The ZDF reporter then asked him if he published the following text about his experiences there: "it often happened to me that the children would unzip my fly and begin to fondle me."

At that point the eloquent European Parliamentarian had the look of a deer caught in the headlights of an oncoming car.

After lots of hemming and hawing, Cohn-Bendit said that he wouldn't recommend now what he recommended then because "we know a lot more about child abuse."

Then, contradicting what he had written, Cohn-Bendit swore: "I never had anything to do with children."

The ZDF reporter remained unconvinced: "It sounds so autobiographical. The descriptions are so personal, as if you had had sex with children."

Cohn-Bendit replied, "Yeah, but that is not true. That is not true. The same thing goes for the parents . . . I'm not mad if people accuse me of that because it was no secret. I was only thinking that you have to look at it in the context of this time and this period. We're talking about '68. That was then. . . ."

Unlike the Catholic Church, which has apologized for the priests who have engaged in sexual activity with children, the Left in general and the

Green Party as its current heir has never "sought ways to repair the damage that they have done to the children of that generation, who were treated like guinea pigs by being subjected to the abstruse ideas of the madman Wilhelm Reich."

Klaus Rainer Poehl writes: "It's in this particular area [the sexualization of children] that his movement has the most to answer for. These evil or stupid deeds have created the biggest aftershock for the movement. It was here that it did its most damage."

Writing around the same time as Hans Fingeller, Herbert Rauter claims that Cohn-Bendit's experiences were "No Isolated Incident." In fact in 1985 the Green Party, the political home of both Cohn-Bendit and Joschka Fischer, advocated the elimination of laws criminalizing sexual relations with children, claiming "they prevent the free development of the personality."

At the beginning of 1985, the Greens proposed legislation which would decriminalize the seduction of girls under 16 years of age as well as homosexual contact with children and teenagers. Their reason? "The threat of punishment inhibits children from discovering their true sexual orientation."

At their state convention in Luedenscheid in March of 1985, the Greens of Nordrhein-Westfalen demanded that "nonviolent sexual activity" between children and adults never be considered as a reason for criminal prosecution. This sort of activity, to the contrary, "must be liberated from all restrictions which this society has placed on it." This resolution was approved by a majority of those in attendance, demonstrating that they considered sexual relations between children and adults a form of "social oppression, which places those who are interested in engaging in nonviolent sex with children in the danger of having their entire lives destroyed from one day to the next if it were to become known that they had relations which all of us consider pleasant, productive, development-enhancing, in short, positive for both parties involved. . . . Therefore, we demand that all criminal sanctions against such sexual activity be removed."

In 1985 the Greens in "Baden-Wuerttemberg . . . attempted to weaken the criminal sanctions against this form of sexual activity. Consensual sex between adults and children should not be punished." Also in 1985, in their political platform (*Auszuege aus dem Wahlprogram der Alternative Liste Berlin*), the Greens claimed that

> It is inhuman to approve sexual activity only for a certain age group and under certain conditions. If young people express the wish to have sex with people of the same age or with older people outside of the family, either because their homosexuality is not accepted by their parents or because they have pedophilic tendencies or for whatever reason, they must be afforded the possibility of acting on these desires.

Let's sum up here. Christopher Hitchens, who has written a book extolling the virtues of atheism and another attacking Mother Teresa, planned to arrest the pope when he arrived in England, but no one arrested Daniel Cohn-Bendit. The Church never condoned this sort of activity in any way, shape or form, much less in the way that the Green Party has, but no one is suing the Green Party for the sexual molestation that took place in the day-care centers of the '60s.

Gaudium et Spes was off the mark when it claimed that the Church had nothing to fear from the modern world. Modernity has always been the enemy of the Church and it remains so today.

But worse than the machinations of her enemies, the Church has adopted the categories of its oppressors in the name of dialogue and as a result blinded itself to what was really going on during this crucial period of Church history. As a result, the Church is still trying to figure out what happened during the '60s. Professor Introvigne claims that

> There was . . . a *Sessantotto* in society and also a *Sessantotto* in the Church: 1968 is itself the year of public dissent against the encyclical "Humanae Vitae" of Paul VI, a dispute that according to a valuable and influential study by the recently deceased American philosopher Ralph McInerny, *What Went Wrong with Vatican II*, represents a point of no return in the crisis of the principle of authority in the Church.

That book was in many ways the result of 15 years of lunches which Ralph and I had together at the Great Wall Chinese restaurant in South Bend, Indiana. Ralph and I also attended the synod on the Laity in Rome together in the late '80s. Ralph, who died in January 2010, was intimately involved in the Revolution of '68. His novel *The Priest* views it from a ringside seat. For 15 years Ralph and I discussed the state of the Church over Chinese food at the Great Wall. What Professor Invigne didn't know is that we also discussed Notre Dame University's involvement in the sexual revolution. Professor Invigne couldn't have known that because Ralph suppressed all of the information on Notre Dame in his book. Missing from Ralph's book was any mention of the role Notre Dame played in the sexualization of the culture, the sexualization of the Catholic Church, or the sexualization of the clergy. The result was an account of this crucial period of Church history which was so truncated that it was seriously misleading. The Chiesa.com symposium is one more proof that the Church is ignorant of its own history. The Church can't win because she is not playing with a full deck.

Less than a week after my return to America, it seemed clear that the sex abuse crisis was far from over. It had by then spread to Belgium, where local police broke into church buildings, barred bishops meeting there from leaving the premises, seized computers and church files, and even bored holes into the tombs of two deceased bishops.[49] The Vatican was outraged by the actions

of the Belgian police, claiming that "there are no precedents, not even under the old communist regimes" for such actions, but the Vatican's apologies for sexual abuse combined with their lack of understanding about how the political instrumentalization of sexual deviance worked made political retaliation like this inevitable. The era of dialogue with the modern world which began with the Council ended with the sound of boots on the stairs and the police banging at the door of the Church and a campaign which made *Kulturkampf* and communist oppression seem mild by comparison. The police raids in Belgium certainly provided the possibility of a new interpretation of *Gaudium et Spes*, but no one in Rome was rising to the challenge of the new hermeneutic.

THE CHURCH AND HER ENEMIES

In talking with Bishop Williamson, it becomes clear that the doctrinal issue is uppermost in his mind, but that's only because he refuses to admit the real cause of the problem, namely, that the SSPX broke communion. Schism is a word that never gets mentioned in traditional circles. Only with difficulty can I broach the topic in our conversation. Bishop Williamson wants to talk about the pope instead, who, according to his view, sometimes says two plus two equals four and sometimes says two plus two equals five.

The pope's views of the Council are certainly tied to a particular *Zeitgeist*, the *Zeitgeist* of the '60s. When he claims that "It was becoming clear that the American Revolution had offered a model of the modern state that was different from that theorized by the radical tendencies that had emerged from the second phase of the French Revolution. . . . Thus, both sides began to progressively open up to each other" what he is really telling us is that he had fallen under the influence of John Courtney Murray and therefore under the influence of *Time Magazine*, which was responsible for Murray's celebrity status, as well as C.D. Jackson, who was the CIA controller/liaison with *Time/Life*. We are talking about the widespread promotion of the self-induced illusion that the Church no long had enemies.

During the 1930s, the Church had enemies. When the Church was strong, which is to say when it was united, the Church won the battles against her enemies. In 1933, the Church in America took on the Jews in Hollywood when Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia called for a boycott of all Warner Brothers theaters in his diocese. The success of that boycott led to the institution of the Hollywood production code. In 1935 the Catholic Church led by Msgr. John A. Ryan, head of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, defeated the WASP ruling class's attempt to get the federal government involved in the funding of contraception. If you ask what had changed in the 30 years between 1933 and 1963, it wasn't Church teaching. Because of Vatican II, the Church believed that she no longer had enemies. In fact, because of a magical

process known as dialogue, our former enemies had been transformed into our friends.

This was not the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church. That had been articulated some 1500 years earlier, when St. Augustine wrote that "Heretics, Jews and Pagans have made a unity against Unity." The loss of its enemies turned the Church against itself. In the absence of external enemies, the presence of evil in the Church had to be attributed to the Church itself. The Church, to cite Bishop Fellay, developed "cancer."

Benjamin Franklin wrote that "Experience keeps an expensive school, but fools will learn in no other." What the Church had to learn in the expensive school which experience has conducted for the past 45 years is that nothing has changed. Our enemies were still our enemies. The only thing that had changed was the sophistication of their tactics.

What the pope's 2005 speech to the Curia shows is that Joseph Ratzinger was influenced by a sophisticated disinformation campaign orchestrated by Henry Luce, the publisher of *Time/Life*, and his Catholic agent, John Courtney Murray. What it does not show is that there are flaws in the conciliar documents. The same is true of *Nostra Aetate* and the Jews, who were paying Malachi Martin to act as a double agent at the Council. Now, as in the past, the Church continues digesting the documents, which is to say it continues to interpret them in light of tradition, which is what the Church has always done. Archbishop Lefebvre accepted the idea; but, as I was to learn in our conversation, evidently Bishop Williamson cannot.

What we're talking about is the background of council documents like *Dignitatis Humanae* and *Nostra Aetate*, but not the documents themselves, which were vetted by the world's bishops. Having attended more than one synod in Rome, I can see how an individual bishop (or a bishops' conference) might introduce a political agenda into the Church's deliberations, but it is not easy to see how this agenda could prevail. In my experience the only thing that the world's bishops could possibly agree upon is Catholicism. Bishop Williamson claims that there are ambiguous statements in the documents of Vatican II, and that this fact justifies his separation. The former statement is undeniably true; the latter undeniably false.

MAYNOOTH, IRELAND, JUNE 19, 2010

Four days before our meeting, I attended a conference on "Fertility, Infertility, Gender," sponsored by the Linacre Centre for Healthcare Ethics at Maynooth, the home of the seminary for Ireland's Catholic priests. The participants at the conference are congenial enough, but looming behind the conference is a pall of both sexual and economic crisis in Ireland and the Irish Church. A bishop freshly deposed by the pope for his negligent handling of the crisis is in attendance. The seminary itself was criticized in the Irish press for its

tolerance of homosexuality. The sex abuse crisis was the topic of talks I would give in Dublin and London.

In May 1992 just as the neoconservative counter-counter revolution in America had declared war on Pat Buchanan, the scandal of Bishop Casey of Galway broke over Ireland. According to Mary Kenny's account in *Goodbye to Catholic Ireland*:

> Bishop Eamonn Casey had had a love-affair in 1974 with an American divorcee, Annie Murphy, had fathered a child by her, deserted her and suggested the child should be placed for adoption; and then in a desperate attempt to hide the truth had used diocesan funds to pay off the mother's claims.

Is fathering a child out of wedlock wrong? Yes, it is. But once again the press seemed determined to punish the only institution willing to uphold moral standards. If illegitimacy were wrong, why weren't the newspapers urging children born out of wedlock to sue the National Basketball Association? Has any institution produced a higher number, per capita, of illegitimate children?

Kenny initially dismissed the story, but before long it became clear that the forces that wanted to destroy Catholic Ireland were not going to let the issue drop.

> During these events of the mid-1990s, I would hear people in Ireland say, "it can't get any worse." And then it did. On any Monday in November 1994, the three leading stories on RTE, the national television network, were the political repercussions following the Brendan Smyth case, the collapse and death of the Dublin priest in a homosexual club sauna, and the conviction of the Galway priest for a sexual assault on a young man: all in one news bulletin. I made no more jokes about Renaissance Popes.[50]

Kenny found that

> The wave upon wave of charges and convictions—nearly all were convicted as charged—was relentless, squalid and depressing. . . . The Brendan Smyth case was not only squalid and depressing: it brought down the government of Albert Reynolds. It was also particularly shocking not just because the offender was an apparently incorrigible paedophile, but because there was evidence that the religious authorities had covered up for him over a number of years. In 1968 he had been given psychiatric counseling for his compulsion, but without apparent amelioration. . . . In its efforts not to "give scandal," it appeared that the Church authorities had enabled a paedophile to continue in his weakness. . . . Some observers predicted that the Peace Process would now falter without the stewardship of Albert Reynolds—all because of the paedophile priest. . . . it was claimed in Dublin that the breakdown would never have occurred if Albert Reynolds had still been Taoiseach.[51]

The sex crisis, in other words, was used to uproot the last elements of Catholic culture in Ireland. The late Tom Herron recounted how the notoriously anti-Catholic *Irish Times* broke the story, and that in turn

> led to the collapse of the government of Albert Reynolds in the Republic of Ireland and the weakening of the Church's influence on Irish society. In this same period the feminist law professor, Mary Robinson, was elected the first female president of the republic and helped to erase traditional sex roles in that country. Her services to the secularization of her native land were appreciated by the international elites when they made her United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees when her term as president was over. Unfortunately Mrs. Robinson's career on the international stage appears to be over as she criticized Israel's treatment of the Palestinian refugees; learning late that no matter how progressive you are there are statements that will end your usefulness to the elites rather quickly.

The Brendan Smyth episode was, in Mary Kenny's words, "yet another onslaught in the ongoing decline and fall of the Irish Catholic Church." But it was becoming clear that the same playbook was being used on both sides of the Atlantic. In Ireland and America, the arsonists were on the fire department payroll. This is true not only of the Fourth Estate, which promoted the sexualization of Ireland during the years following the Council, and therefore, Ireland's clergy, but also of the psychological/counseling establishment. After creating the crisis by undermining the morals of the clergy, the psychology/counseling establishment cashed in on the settlements by offering therapy to the victims. The irony is not lost on Mary Kenny:

> A million pounds was immediately spent on a help-line and counseling after abuse victims of the industrial schools mentioned in Suffer the Little Children were opened. It was ironic that the Catholic Church was using the very psychotherapeutic techniques which, 50 years previously, it had so condemned in the works of Freud.

In 1995 Ireland was rocked with revelations about Father Michael Cleary, who had died of cancer in 1993. According to Kenny, Cleary "had been one of Dublin's best-known and most popular priests. Back in the 1960s, he had been hailed as the best type of modernizing young priest, hip and cool, accessible to the young, quick to play a guitar and sing a pop song; and yet at the same time, with strong moral convictions and a strong social conscience."

Unlike the homosexual clergy, who could be counted on to be one-issue, useful idiots, Cleary was a heterosexual and against abortion. When the woman by whom he had fathered two children published a lurid memoir after his death—"My Secret Life as Priest's Wife for 27 Years" was a splash front-page headline for the Dublin tabloid, the *Sunday World*—the Church was again left holding the bag. Once again, celibacy was to blame, and the moral

order which the Church defended was henceforth to be considered suspect by the very fact that the Church defended it. "To hell with prayers," wrote Mary Ellen Synon in the *Sunday Independent.*

The feminists then volunteered to be the willing executioners for the therapeutic state. Nell McCafferty, a Derry radical and nationally-known feminist, was both more vehement and more explicit than her colleague at the *Sunday Independent.* McCafferty wrote that Catholic priests had lost all entitlement to discourse upon sexual morality.

> Next time they open their mouths on love, sex, contraception, abortion, homosexuality, pleasure – on anything that goes on between consenting healthy adults – their words should be publicly quoted back to them. . . . Now let them shut up while people put themselves and their families back together again, and knock some delicious, loving sexual pleasure out of life. In the meantime, beware the local priest. He is a danger to your mental, physical and sexual health. Never leave one alone with a child. Not ever.

In Ireland as in America, the feminists functioned as the shock troops of the new world order by claiming that the Church had no authority to speak on sexual matters. That was soon extended to include all instances of morality, which of course included any condemnations of avarice, theft, and looting, behaviors which characterize capitalism, which was waiting in the wings to fill the moral vacuum which the feminists had just created by undermining the authority of the Catholic Church.

The common denominator which the Neoconservative take-over of Catholic institutions in America and the Irish priest pedophile crisis share is capitalism. As Mary Kenny put it:

> Market capitalism, which is essential to the Celtic tiger boom, depends on individual lifestyle choices, initiative, tolerance of diversity. It also depends on people valuing, not rebuffing, material gain. The "authoritarianism" of the Catholic Church, with its strong directional tradition and concept of orthodoxy, is anathema to the market. Individualism is essential. Those who have studied their Max Weber (*The Protestant Work Ethic and the Rise of Capitalism*) would say that it was not coincidental that Catholicism receded as capitalism triumphed: they would say it was necessary for Catholicism to recede in order for capitalism to triumph. The Protestant mindset, that you make your own choices for salvation, bypassing any form of "priest-craft," is a cultural pre-condition for free market capitalism. Were there any conspiracy-theory Trotskyites left under the age of 60, they might almost suspect a capitalist plot to discredit the priests, to free Ireland for market capitalism.[52]

Ten years later, as abuse reports continued to roll in *Pravda* agreed with Kenny. The by now world-wide sex abuse crisis in the Church

> has ideological connotations and follows a political agenda that seeks to deconstruct traditional society and all its secular institutions and to impose a New World Order after the manner of the sinister interests of the international oligarchy, the same ones that handle the financial markets and through them, largely control the global economy. We refer to cases of pedophilia within the ranks of the Catholic Church recently publicized by international news agencies.
>
> Indeed recent reports of pedophilia involving priests have the outlines of information that journalistic ethics require, regardless of their moral gravity. Such stories raise suspicion about their "goodness" even among non-Catholics like us. Although disagreeing with the doctrine of the Catholic Church, in some respects, but we recognize the importance of their role in our history to defend the ethical values that shape our Judeo-Christian culture and their social merit on behalf of those who have been victims of the usury and greed of the international oligarchy, which is after all more interested in destroying Catholicism and religion in general, as they constitute a serious obstacle to achieving its goal, which is to reduce mankind to the status of robotic slaves.

Pravda mentioned the case of Father Lawrence Murphy as a particularly egregious case of media-inspired witch-hunt:

> The fury of the anti-clerical secular lobby goes so far as to revive old cases like that of Father Lawrence Murphy, back in 1975, to address the current Pope insidiously and in this way, the very Roman Catholic Church. On 25 March of this year, the prestigious *New York Times* published an article that allegedly accused Benedict XVI of covering up for the priest from Milwaukee in 1995 when the Pope was still Cardinal and responsible for the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. It must be motivated by a very strong hatred of Catholicism to raise this issue 35 years afterwards . . .

Pravda accuses the *New York Times* of engaging in "a defamatory smear campaign . . . against the world Catholic hierarchy" for the benefit of "philanthropic foundations like the Rockefeller family" whose "financial interests of those are linked to a wide range of economic sectors ranging from banking, oil, pharmaceuticals, military industry, etc., to audio visual media, including the 'media,' which clearly meets an agenda dictated by the Global Elite to which they belong."

Kenny claims that the rise of capitalism meant the decline of the Church. In fact she claimed that capitalism could only flourish in Ireland if the Church were discredited. The publicity campaigns for Capitalist Ireland and against Catholic Ireland were different sides of the same coin. By 2000, mammon had replaced the Catholic Church as the organizing principle for Irish society:

> By 2000, a special *Sunday Times* survey of Irish 30-year-olds was claiming that for the young Irish "Money is the new religion and they're queuing up to pay homage to the folding stuff. God plays second fiddle to Bill Gates . . . while sin is forgetting to nail down decent equity options. This generation is more likely to worship at a stock exchange than at a cathedral, to seek a pension advisor than a confessor."[53]

The debut in 2000 of the film version of Frank McCort's book *Angela's Ashes* was part of this campaign to discredit the Catholic Church in Ireland and pave the way for unrestrained capitalism. Kenny feels that "Alan Parker might as well have made a film called *How All Irish People are Absolutely Horrible.* For there is scarcely anyone in the whole story of provincial Ireland in the 1930s and '40s with an ounce of humanity." Everyone in the Limerick of *Angela's Ashes* is especially beastly to children: "It goes without saying that the Catholic Church is sneering, cruel, rejecting and exploitative, and the charity, the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, is represented by most particularly odious characters who taunt poor women before they patronize them."

The Catholic Church is even blamed for being involved in money-lending.

> There is a repellant moneylender who exploits the poor of Limerick, and although for historical reasons which are entirely understandable, moneylenders in Ireland were traditionally Jewish, it is understood now in Ireland by the media that you are only allowed to be nasty about Catholics; so the moneylender in the story has to be made into a spiteful Catholic vixen, complete with statues of the Blessed Virgin scattered about her extortionate book-keeping.[54]

The Jews were left out of the McCourt/Parker story of money-lending in Ireland because the goal of *Angela's Ashes* was to discredit "Catholic Ireland." According to Kenny, the sex abuse crisis was proof that "the *Angela's Ashes* movie was correct after all: Catholic Ireland had been a horrible society, in which horrible people had prevailed. It had been a society in which harshness made for inhumanity."

Mary Kenny wrote her book in 2000 at the height of the economic boom in Ireland known as the Celtic Tiger. By the time I arrived in Ireland ten years later, the Celtic Tiger was dead of its own wretched excess. Irish debt stood at 1,275 percent of Gross Domestic Product, roughly ten times as high as Greece's debt, and yet no one was talking about Ireland.

The people who attended my talk in Dublin were hardly a representative sample of the Irish people, but it was hard not to generalize from their plight. Most of the men were unemployed and living off a combination of welfare and subsistence farming. Ireland has a population of 4 million souls. Of that 4 million, 1.8 million are gainfully employed and 500,000 are on welfare. Saying good-bye to Catholic Ireland meant saying hello again to the same

wretched capitalism that had driven my grandfather from his farm near Cork to Philadelphia over a century before.

THE MAYNOOTH CONFERENCE

The Maynooth conference sponsored by the Linacre Centre was more upscale than my talk. The Linacre Centre conference on bioethics at Maynooth had the air of Human Life International conferences I had attended 20 to 25 years earlier. It was long on the arcane particulars of genetic engineering of various sorts but short on the cultural ligaments which held these techniques together in one explainable fabric of pathology. The Linacre Centre has fought a valiant rearguard action against the Culture of Death in England, which has one of the most advanced genetic engineering establishments in the world. England was heavily involved in *in vitro* fertilization when the rest of the world, including America, hardly knew what it was. The Linacre Centre brought out a brilliant little book on the consequences of this violation of nature, entitled *Who Am I?* The book tracked the plight of children who were fathered by donor insemination and grew up with the uncanny sense that things weren't as they seemed. This sense of biological insecurity is something that isn't supposed to exist in the brave new world of genetic technology. (The only reaction the children got when they objected to growing up without a biological father was being told that they should be grateful to be alive.)

And yet here as elsewhere the Church is handicapped by its allegiance to a culture which despises everything the Church stands for. Missing from the talks, I thought, was any understanding of the deliberate instrumentalization of deviance which united all of the individual pathologies. To make my point during the question and answer period following talks on sexual ethics (by Alexander Pruss, Luke Gormally, and Dr. Philip Sutton), I described the collapse of the Black-Jewish alliance and the rise of the homosexual as the *avant garde* of revolution beginning with the Stonewall Riot of 1969. No one objected to my comments at the time, but a number of people complained privately about them afterwards.

It was a scenario depressingly similar to the handling of the priest abuse crisis. As soon as you get specific about the historical circumstances and *dramatis personae* involved in a particular crisis, someone attempts to shut down the discussion. I was reminded of the reaction of Bernard Cardinal Law to my article on Niels Rasmussen's death, which appeared in *Fidelity* in January 1988.[55] Rasmussen, a Danish Dominican who was head of the liturgy program at Notre Dame, was found shot to death in the basement of his house surrounded by whips and chains, homosexual pornography, and automatic weapons, one of which had killed him. After I presented him with a copy of the article, Cardinal Law asked, "What good does this serve?" Perhaps his eminence now knows what good the article served. Within a few short years,

Cardinal Law would be driven from office as a result of not wanting to know the bad news about sexual corruption among the clergy.

The most famous example of the sexual engineering of the Catholic clergy is Carl Rogers' use of Sensitivity Training to destroy the Los Angeles branch of the Immaculate Heart nuns. We broke that story 25 years ago when we published an article by William Coulson, Rogers' assistant, detailing what Rogers had done to the nuns. If you're interested in the full story, it's told in my book *Libido Dominandi: Sexual Liberation and Political Control.*

Four years before Carl Rogers began introducing sensitivity training to the Immaculate Heart nuns in Los Angeles, Abraham Maslow was doing similar work on another group of nuns at the other end of the country. On April 17, 1962 Maslow gave a lecture to a group of nuns at Sacred Heart College in Massachusetts. Afterward he noted in his diary, that his talk had been very "successful," but he found this fact troubling "They shouldn't applaud me," he continued, "they should attack. If they were fully aware of what I was doing, they would [attack]." And why should they have attacked him?

Maslow was aware that encounter groups were toxic for Catholics in general and especially toxic for Catholic religious. Anyone who promoted encounter groups among Catholics was promoting *ipso facto* their demise as Catholics, even if he did so in the name of liberation and with that as his intent. For the liberal Jew or Protestant, the nun was the textbook case of someone in need of "liberation" and in the context of Catholic religious life and the vows upon which it was based, liberation could only mean annihilation. On February 25, 1967, Maslow wrote in his diary, "Maybe morons need rules, dogmas, ceremonies, etc." He then made a note to order a book entitled *Life Among the Lowbrows* for the Brandeis library. He may have ordered it because the author of that book noted in it that "feebleminded clients behaved much better and felt better being Catholic and following all the rules." Since the nuns weren't feebleminded, this meant that bringing "self-actualization" to the nuns meant destroying their commitment to their vows and the Catholic Church. Perhaps this is why Maslow felt they shouldn't have applauded his talk in 1962. Maslow, who had spent time at the National Training Laboratories' headquarters in Bethel, Maine, where encounter groups, with the help of subsidies from the Office of Naval Research, had been created; he knew that they were funded as a form psychological warfare, and he had an inkling of the effect they would have on nuns, but it was up to his colleague Carl Rogers to do the actual experiment.

"I guess what I'm trying to say here," Maslow wrote in his journal in 1965, the same year that Carl Rogers began circulating his paper on the psychology of small group encounter among the IHM nuns and around the time that the nuns started to leave the convent, "is that these interpersonal therapeutic growth-fostering relationships of all kinds which rest on intimacy, on honesty, on self-disclosure, on becoming sensitively aware of one's self—and thereby

of responsibility for feeding back one's impression of others, etc.—*that these are profoundly revolutionary devices*, in the strict sense of the word—that is, of shifting the whole direction of a society in a more preferred direction. As a matter of fact, it might be revolutionary in another sense if something like this were done very widely. I think the whole culture would change within a decade and everything in it.[56]

In an article in *Culture Wars* in 2004, Patrick Guinan, M.D. described the devastating effects that the systematic implementation of these revolutionary techniques would have on religious life in the United States. What we're talking about here is the wholesale abandonment of ascetical practice among the clergy, or as Guinan put it:

> What changed between the first and second halves of the twentieth century were not the management policies on sex abuse and secrecy at all costs—these remained a constant throughout—nor do we have evidence to show that the personality features of seminarians or priests changed in any fundamental way that would account for the nature and the magnitude of the crisis—in its early stages at least. . . . the core change over the course of the 20t[h] century was one of purpose or allegiance—leaving behind ascetical discipline, having disdain for religious tradition, and adopting the therapeutic mentality, a popular belief that fulfillment of the human person springs from emotional desire in a quest for self-definition, or self-actualization, without regard to an objective philosophical, religious or moral truth. Further, the therapeutic mentality views sin as a social concern and discourages loyalty to religious authority; it is profoundly anti-ascetical.
>
> Allegiance to the therapeutic mentality has dislodged ascetical habits and manners, and it now holds sway over the attitudes of clergy, just as it strengthened its materialist grip on western societies for nearly a century. Mental health experts and educators, as the main purveyors of the therapeutic mentality, know little of the spiritual life and are ignorant of ascetical discipline. Nevertheless, in the name of science, and as the prime representatives of the educated elite, they advocated a liberalization of sexual standards before the sexual scandal in the Church, and then attempted to advise the bishops and to treat problem priests as the crisis took form. Bishops, who have oversight of the parish priests and seminaries, and who have been at the center of the crisis management, do not speak much, if at all, about ascetical discipline. Priests give few indications that they know or care about ascetical discipline. But most clergy seemed well versed in language of the therapeutic mentality. Predictably, when the storm surge in pagan sexuality began to overwhelm the natural defenses of the clergy in the 1950s and 1960s, those without the spiritual anchor of ascetical discipline were set adrift—perpetrators as

> well as their managers. As the initial storm surge receded, a spawn of the therapeutic mentality remained in the tidal pools.

The man who introduced these ideas into the Church and therefore the man most responsible for the sexual corruption of the American clergy was the psychologist and former Maryknoll priest Eugene Kennedy. In 1972 Father Kennedy was commissioned by the United States Catholic bishops do a survey of American priests. Kennedy was a disciple of Erik Erikson, aka, Erik Salomonsen, Erik Homburger, a Jewish psychiatrist who, like Wilhelm Reich, was deeply influenced by the writings of Sigmund Freud. Central to the thinking of both men was the idea that sexual repression was psychologically damaging, a theory totally at odds with the Catholic tradition of a celibate clergy.

In addition to Freud's theory of sexual repression, Kennedy also imported Erikson's theory of ego development, according to which each person went through eight developmental stages:

> 1) the first year of life, 2) through the second year, 3) from age three to six, 4) from age of six to puberty, 5) adolescence, 6) early adulthood, 7) young and middle adulthood, and 8) later adulthood. Each stage had to be successfully worked through for normal development. Stage six required sexual intimacy and expression.

According to the teaching of the Catholic Church, "Chastity is an aspect of temperance which inclines a person to deliberately forego sexual relations for ascetical purposes." According to Freud and Erickson, any such renunciation in the name of religion, which both men considered a dangerous illusion, "would be abnormal and possibly pathologic."

When Kennedy's survey came out in book form as *The Catholic Priest in the United States: Psychological Investigations*, the results were a foregone conclusion, given the premises with which he began his study. Of the 271 priests surveyed, Kennedy found that only 19 (or 7 percent) could be termed psychologically "developed." The overwhelming majority of American priests were "not developed," because they had not engaged in sexual activity.

> The standard against which the priests were judged was Erickson's development scale. Because the majority of priests were underdeveloped, they remained in Stage Six or the early adult stage, because in order to get beyond Stage Six, the priests would have to engage in "sexual intimacy."

Guinan claims that Kennedy's study contributed to the sexual abuse crisis by giving the impression that celibacy was nothing more than repression, and that repression was unhealthy:

> If repression is portrayed as psychologically unhealthy, it can be argued that Kennedy's *Psychological Investigations* and its flawed psychology gave support and justification to beliefs that resulted in the sex abuse of minors.

> Erickson's insistence that sexual intimacy was essential to successfully traverse developmental stage six, justified sexual acting out in general, but it also justified sexual activity with predominantly male minors, who because of their proximity were the targets of abusive priests.

Guinan goes on to blame Kennedy for the current priest scandals:

> When *Psychological Investigations* was published in 1972, it relied on Erickson's and Freud's materialist psychology, which posited unrestrained sexual behavior as inevitable and healthy. Seminary formation programs as well as individual priests accepted Kennedy uncritically and in an effort to move beyond Stage Six and become normal through sexual intimacy began acting out sexually. Since priests, many of whom were homosexually inclined, had ready access to adolescent males, this vulnerable group of victims was disproportionately targeted. While some abusers were implicated in serial rapes many involved only isolated cases. Nonetheless most involved coercion and all were breaches of both the sixth and ninth commandments as well as the vow of chastity. The scandal, now involving hundreds of cases, has resulted in significant damage to efforts at evangelization in the United States, to say nothing of the staggering financial losses.

In 1976 the revolution that Reich had predicted came out into the open. The inaugural event was a celebration of the bicentennial of America known as the Call to Action Conference. The revolution was led by the sexualized clergy. Call to Action was the Catholic equivalent of the tennis court oaths. The Revolution was now out in the open. The vector of revolutionary transmission was the Church's educational system.

Two of the participants at the Call to Action Conference were Dr. & Mrs. John Krejci. In 1996 both Dr. & Mrs. Krejci were excommunicated by Bishop Fabian Bruskewitz, ordinary of the diocese of Lincoln, Nebraska, for belonging to an anti-Catholic organization, namely Call to Action. During the 1960s, Professor Krejci was Father Krejci, a priest who was working on his doctorate in theology and Mrs. Krejci was a nun by the name of Jean Gettelfinger. Mr. & Mrs. Krejci met at Notre Dame. Like many religious who attended that university, Father Krejci and Sister Gettelfinger got married, and when they did they left their religious orders.

The real problem lay with the clergy who felt no reason to leave because they were homosexual. Once the heterosexuals ran off and got married, the Church was left with a serious homosexual problem. Germain Grisez says most "abuse" consists in seduction by homosexual priests:

> The bishops and those who speak for them should acknowledge honestly that most clerical sex crimes that have come to light have been seductions of adolescents and young men by homosexual priests. Because Jesus entrusts bishops to oversee the pastoral care of souls, those bishops who

> failed to do all that they could and should have done to prevent or limit a priest's crimes ought to ponder very carefully the moral and spiritual nature and gravity of their own omissions and actions. Having done that, those bishops should reexamine their consciences, repent any sins they previously overlooked, and begin to do what they can and should do by way of restitution.

The Church was then denied the ability to solve its homosexual problem because the dominant culture that was leveling the accusations refused to admit that homosexuality was a problem, much less the problem that was tearing the Church apart. The issue is complicated by the hypocrisy and double standards of the institutions that were acting as judge, jury and executioner in the sex abuse scandals. The media continued making contradictory demands on the Church. On the one hand, the media, especially during the '70s, were claiming that we should all act on our sexual impulses whether they are congruent with the moral law or not. Thirty years later, the same institutions were claiming that certain people should be punished for doing what they were told to do.

The media is claiming that there is nothing wrong with homosexuality, ignoring the fact that 80 percent of the offenses which have been proven involve homosexual behavior between clergy and victims over the age of puberty. Because the campaign against the Church coincided with a campaign by the same group of people to legitimize homosexuality, the Church was denied any effective way of defending itself against the sexual fifth column which had established itself in the Church in the wake of the implementation of Vatican II. Professor Schockenhoff claims that "Dialogue with the Jews" is a non-negotiable part of Church teaching now, but during the sex abuse crisis, the Church's "elder brothers" sided with the homosexual fifth column which was the source of the Church's woes. For example, Jewish organizations demanded that the Obama administration permit no exemptions of conscience for the Catholic Church when it came to hiring homosexuals.

When it came to media concern about sex scandals in the Church, it is increasingly difficult to separate the arsonists from the fire department. As the late Tom Herron wrote in *Culture Wars*:

> Father Shanley of Boston used to be the toast of the award winning *Boston Globe* back in the early '70s when he was a long-haired street priest who worked with young people, spoke against Catholic moral teachings and was a known early founder of NAMBLA (North American Man-Boy Love Association.) Thirty years later, the same newspaper, *The Boston Globe*, "was instrumental in bringing him back from retirement in California to face trial and imprisonment in Massachusetts."

GIFT AND *DIGNITAS PERSONAE* #12

One of the most powerful presentations at the Linacre Conference was given by a Jesuit by the name of Kevin Flannery. Twenty-five years earlier, he and Paul Mankowski, another Jesuit speaker at the conference, showed up at my house as newly ordained priests. At the time I took it as a sign of hope for a bright future in the Church that the Jesuits would ordain dedicated men like this. What I should have told these bright young men back then is "if you wish to serve the Lord, prepare for suffering." Paul Mankowski, who would go on to receive a degree in Semitic philology at Harvard while serving as boxing coach there, would spend the next 25 years circling the ring with his Jesuit superiors, fending them off with theological jabs like "I accept the authority of my Jesuit superiors insofar as it is congruent with the teaching of the Catholic Church." Father Mankowski spent years teaching at the Biblicum, but as part of the ongoing battle over his allegiance to the Jesuits and his final vows he was summarily dismissed and sent to teach freshman Latin at a ghetto high school in Chicago.

Father Flannery fared better at the Gregorian University in Rome, where he became a dean, but that only enabled him to become involved in abstruse bioethical doctrinal battles at the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith. His talk was about one of those battles. Paragraph #12 of *Dignitas Personae*, the most recent document on fertility technology issued by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, has been taken to imply that procedures like GIFT (or Gamete Intrafallopian Transfer) are morally acceptable. Father Flannery feels that they are not because they "involve a third active factor" which violates the integrity of the sexual act. Father Flannery used the rest of his talk to explain how this contradiction arose and how he as a faithful Catholic had to deal with it:

> How has the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith gotten into this tangle of setting out conditions for morally acceptable procedures and then saying that procedures that cannot meet those conditions are acceptable? In my opinion, what has happened is that, when the Church first began to consider these issues and her thinking was more clear than it is now, she set out sound principles for their analysis. She has also always been aware of couples—both within the Church and without—who experience difficulties in conceiving and who desperately want children: a very natural and, therefore, good desire in itself. So, while continuing to propound the sound principles at the core of the Church's teaching, the Congregation has seized upon whatever opportunity the language with which those principles are formulated affords—or appears to afford—in order to approve procedures that might allow couples to have children.

Father Flannery bolstered his case by citing one document after another which showed that "In this regard, the teaching of the magisterium is *already*

explicit" ("*Ad rem quod attinet, magisterii doctrina iam explicata est*"). He then attempts to explain how a doctrine that is "already explicit" could undergo corruption by giving a close analysis of Pius XII's 1949 address to midwives:

> He first says that artificial fertilization outside of marriage is to be condemned as immoral and that the child resulting from such a procedure would be illegitimate. (Repeatedly in his addresses regarding this issue Pius XII expresses concern for the upbringing of progeny and so also for their legitimacy.) He then says that artificial fertilization "within marriage, but effected by the active factor of a third party, is equally immoral and, as such, to be condemned out of hand."[57] The problem with such a procedure, he says, is that, "between the legitimate husband and the child, fruit of the active factor of a third party (even were the husband consenting), there exists no connection of origin: no moral and juridical connection of conjugal procreation."[58] In effect, the problem is that the husband in this marriage has not *generated* the child who results from the procedure, for generation has been effected by the third party. It is clear that the problem here for Pius XII is not illegitimacy, for he speaks of the husband as legitimate; the problem is rather, who has generated the child: who is the initiator, the agent, whose action results in the generation of a child?

How then did the corruption of doctrine come about?

> The small word *iam* inserted into the paraphrase makes all the difference. Where Pius XII speaks simply of "the natural act performed in a normal manner" ("*l'acte naturel normalement accompli*"), the paraphrase, imposing a meaning upon the participle "accompli" it can hardly bear, speaks of an act that *has been* normally performed in the past. The Supreme Pontiff is suddenly not condemning all types of fertilization but approving one type—a type in which clearly the act of generation is not the conjugal act but an act performed by technicians in a lab.

Father Flannery, as a result, finds himself in a dilemma.

> This all places individuals (such as myself) who believe that they owe to the teachings of the magisterium *religiosum voluntatis et intellectus obsequium* in something of a dilemma. One welcome way out of the dilemma would be to discover that we (I) am simply wrong: there is something wrong with the present analysis and there is nothing contradictory about the teaching of DP§12 (and the related teaching in *Donum vitae*).
>
> But let us say that I am not wrong. It is logically impossible to give *obsequium* (of any sort) to a set of ideas that are contradictory and recognized as such: *obsequium* involves at the very least acknowledgement that a set of ideas could be true, but a contradiction cannot be true.

The way out of this dilemma is not to be found by leaving the Church because:

finding such a contradiction does not leave obedient sons and daughters of the Church completely in the lurch, for the teaching office of the Church is exercised within a tradition of moral reflection inspired by the Holy Spirit. An incoherent paragraph or two in a magisterial document—such as are inevitable when human beings are writing the documents—do not cancel out the tradition, but quite the converse: the offending paragraphs (if they truly are such) ought to be judged from the perspective of the tradition. This is the proper attitude to adopt toward *Dignitas personae* §12, derived as it is from *Donum vitae*, which states that "in this regard"—that is, in regard to homologous artificial fertilization—"the teaching of the magisterium is already explicit."[59]

NEW LIGHT

Father Flannery's struggle throws a new light on the complaints of Bishop Williamson. To begin with, unlike Bishop Williamson, who complains about ambiguous statements in council documents, Father Flannery believes he has come across an actual contradiction of Church teaching. The only way the contradiction in *Dignitatis Humanae* 12 is going to be resolved is the way the Church has resolved issues in the past, which is to say, by going over the issue again and reconstruing it in the light of tradition. *Non datur tertius.* There is no other way. To pretend there is is to be radically anti-traditional.

This is precisely what the SSPX is refusing to do by refusing to affirm their acceptance of the documents of Vatican II as interpreted in the light of tradition. All that Bishop Williamson and the SSPX have to do to be readmitted to the Church is affirm the statement, "I accept the documents of Vatican II in the light of tradition." He does not have to affirm that x number of Jews died in the holocaust. He does not have to affirm Professor Schockenhoff's interpretation of Vatican II or his endorsement of "*Gespraech mit dem Judentum.*"

When Bishop Williamson tells me this affirmation of Vatican II in the light of tradition is the condition which Rome has set for readmission to the Church, I blurt out, "It's that simple?"

"It's not that simple," Williams replies.

"Yes, it is," I feel like saying, but do not.

"If we sign this document, we are affirming the validity of Vatican II which means that we are affirming the very thing which is destroying the Church."

The statement is patently preposterous, but I bite my tongue and attempt to steer the conversation in another direction.

"Has the Church failed in its mission?" I ask.

"No," Bishop Williamson replies.

"Then there's no reason to separate from the Church."

"We haven't separated from the Church."

"Then what are the negotiations about then?"

Before long it becomes apparent that they are about bringing Rome around to the point of view of the SSPX. As another sign that the discussions are doomed to go nowhere, Bishop Williamson told me that an SSPX priest is planning to use their meeting with the Ecclesia Dei commission in the Spring of 2011 as an opportunity to the explain to Rome the errors in *Dignitatis Humanae*. This dialogue became Mission Impossible for a number of reasons. First, by concentrating on doctrinal issues in general and Vatican II in particular, it avoided the main issue, namely, schism, which has nothing to do with doctrine. Secondly, there are large segments of the hierarchy which confuse the documents of Vatican II with the spirit of Vatican II and as a result want to make readmission to the Church contingent on a particular theological interpretation of council documents rather than an affirmation of the documents themselves "in the light of tradition." Bishop Williamson seems determined to conflate Rome with that group of people, thereby granting an unearned victory to the George Weigels and Professor Schockenhoffs, and allowing them by default to impose a neocon litmus test on the rest of the Church.

As if to answer my question about the purpose of the negotiations, Bishop Williamson gets up to look for a large piece of paper. I volunteer a page from my notebook, but it's not large enough to convey the sweep of his idea, which is that throughout history movements have broken off from the Church, as did the Arians, the Protestants, the revolutionaries in France, but through it all the Church has maintained its commitment to tradition and the Scriptures. This sounds like an argument against the SSPX position to me, but that's only because I see the Church and the SSPX as separate entities. For Bishop Williamson, they are one and the same. The frustrating thing about conversation with him lies in his inability to acknowledge the premises upon which his argument is based. So when I ask if the SSPX is the Church, he immediately says no.

BACK AND FORTH

Our conversation goes back and forth over Church history. His excellency brings up the Inquisition, intimating that if it were re-established, he would rejoin the Church. I point out that there was a time when there was no Inquisition, but there has never been a time since Christ walked the earth that there has been no Church. He brings up doctrine, but the same applies here. There was a time when no Christian could say for certain that Christ was true God and true man, because the formula hadn't been articulated, but there was never a time when there was no Church. I then bring up the Church's position on usury, which is still awaiting its definitive explication.

By now it's time for lunch and the theological discussion lurches to an unresolved end. After lunch, his excellency takes a nap and I prepare my talk

by walking around the gravel track in the lower garden, making mental notes about the talk which gradually get supplanted with thoughts about what I would do if it were my garden. When Father Morgan, the English SSPX superior, appears to give the timetable for the rest of the afternoon, I tell him that the middle of the garden would be the ideal place for a fountain.

"My mother said the same thing," he replied.

In the end the talk went well, there was a lively question and answer period afterward, but no one in attendance addressed the talk's conclusion, which I reproduce here in its entirety:

> Yes, the Church was derelict in not preaching the gospel, especially on sexual matters. Yes, the Church chose therapy over the penal sanctions required by canon law. Yes, the Church is being punished for following the advice of the psychologists. Yes, the current scandals are being orchestrated by the Church's traditional enemies, Protestants and Jews, in order to destroy traditional cultures and make the world safe for Capitalism and the universal rule of Mammon. But what is the proper response?
>
> Let's answer that question by explaining what is not the proper response. In a recent interview, Bishop Fellay talked about the current state of the Society of St. Pius X. After throwing Bishop Williamson under the bus, Bishop Fellay went on to say that "the Church has cancer" and that "we do not want to embrace the Church because we might contract cancer."
>
> There are a number of things one might say about such a statement. First of all, cancer is not contagious. Secondly, this image—the Church has cancer—can be found nowhere in the tradition of the Church, not in the Gospels, not in the Acts of the Apostles, not in the Epistles and not in the writing of the Church Fathers. The reason is simple enough: it does not and cannot correspond to reality.
>
> If the cancer image is faulty, anti-traditional and unscriptural, what image does correspond to the situation of the Church in our time? The answer is the story in Mark 4:35-41, the story of Jesus calming the storm. We are told that:
>
> It began to blow a gale, and the waves were breaking into the boat so that it was almost swamped. But [Jesus] was in the stern, his head on the cushion, asleep. They woke him and said to him, "Master, do you not care? We are going down!" And he woke up and rebuked the wind and said to the sea, "Quiet now! Be calm!" And the wind dropped and all was calm again. Then he said to them, "Why are you so frightened? How is it that you have no faith?" They were filled with awe and said to one another, "Who can this be? Even the wind and the sea obey him."

All of the Church Fathers are unanimous in saying that the boat is the Church and that the boat is going to be tossed about by storms, which is to say, campaigns orchestrated to destroy the Church.

St. Hilary of Poitiers writes that Christ "bids us to be within the Church, and to be in peril until such time as returning in His splendor He shall give salvation to all the people . . . Meanwhile the disciples are tossed by the wind and the waves; struggling against all the storms of this world, raised by the opposition of the unclean spirit."

St. Augustine tells us to "Think of the boat as the Church, and the stormy sea as this world. . . . For when any of a wicked will and of great power, proclaims a persecution against the Church, then it is that a mighty wave rises against the boat of Christ." We are to remain in that storm-tossed boat until, "when the night is nearly ended, He shall come, in the end of the world, when the night of iniquity is past, to judge the quick and the dead."

When Christ finally does come, according to St. Hilary, he will "find His Church wearied, and tossed by the spirit of the Anti-Christ, and by the troubles of this world. And because by long experience of Anti-Christ they will be troubled at every novelty of trial, they shall have fear even at the approach of the Lord, suspecting deceitful appearances. But the good Lord banishes their fear saying, *It is I*; and by proof of His presence takes away their dread of impending shipwreck."

From the perspective of the faithful who have to endure these storms, it always seems as if Jesus is asleep, which is to say, unconcerned with their plight. This is, of course, not the case. God is always with his Church, even when it appears that he is not. Jumping ship means instant death. Because God can calm any storm, the real issue is not the magnitude of the storm, but rather as Jesus points out, the magnitude of our faith.

THE ONLY THING

As things stand now, the only thing holding back the reconciliation of the SSPX and the Church is Bishop Williamson's (and three other SSPX bishops') signature on a document that he admits Archbishop Lefebvre would have signed. Four days after I gave my talk at SSPX headquarters in Wimbledon, it was clear that my overture to Bishop Williamson had failed. On June 28, 2010, his excellency wrote on his blog:

> Archbishop Lefebvre chose a third way, in between the two extremes of either Truth or Authority. His way, in which he has been followed by that SSPX, was to cling to Catholic Truth, but with no disrespect towards Church Authority, nor any blanket disbelief in the status of its

> officials. It is a balance certainly not always easy to keep, but it has borne Catholic fruit all over the world, and it has sustained a faithful remnant of Catholics with true doctrine and the true sacraments for the 40 years we have so far spent in the Conciliar desert (1970-2010). In that desert we Catholic sheep may have to be scattered for a while yet, as long as the Shepherd in Rome is struck (Zech. XIII, 7, quoted by Our Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane—Mt. XXVI, 31). In this Gethsemane of the Church, we do need compassion on our fellow sheep. . . . But that no way means that the third way as traced out by Archbishop Lefebvre has ceased to be the right way.

Non datur tertius. When it comes to the Church there is no third way. Bishop Williamson affirms here all of the propositions—the Church has failed in its mission, the SSPX is the Church—that he denied in our conversation. The only thing that remains the same is his adamant refusal to restore communion, not even on terms that Archbishop Lefebvre would have accepted. In his history of the Hussite rebellion in Bohemia, Aeneas Silvio Piccolomini, who took the name Pius II when he became pope, referred to Jan Zizka, the one-eyed military genius who lost both eyes leading the invincible Hussite armies, as "the blind leader of a blind people." The phrase kept popping into my mind during our interview, but especially when Bishop Williamson said that the society was going to break apart, for it seems as if he is determined to stick by an organization that is doomed to self-destruct.

As a gesture of friendship, I gave Bishop Williamson a copy of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and its Impact on World History.* On the first page of the book, I wrote a dedication "To Bishop Williamson," and then added "*Ut unum sint.*" He laughed when he read it, and everyone else at the table laughed when I said that an artifact like this was destined to end up in the Holocaust Museum in Washington. What occurred to me later is that the SSPX is more like the Jews than either of us were willing to admit. Like the Jews, the time of their visitation had arrived and the SSPX was too blind to see it. They were unable to sign a document that Archbishop Lefebvre could have signed without hesitation, and in failing to sign it they were unable to see that they were doing more to enhance the modernist agenda they ostensibly oppose than if they had accepted their rightful position as docile members of the Church.

Ultimately, the inscription was no laughing matter. Unity in the Church is not some optional feature, like white wall tires on a car. It goes to the very heart of Christ's conception of the Church and it goes to the very heart as well of the woes that have been inflicted on the world since the cataclysmic violation of that unity which followed from the events of 1517. That situation was not improved by the events of 1988.

Bishop Williamson was 69 years old, one year short of the Biblical allotment of years granted to men. If the society is going to break up anyway, I argued, then let it be through his unilateral signing of the agreement with Rome. At this suggestion, he simply threw up his hands, as if to say the suggestion was too preposterous for words. The suggestion is far from preposterous. In fact, as live options went, it was the only option he had left.

Chapter Three

The End of Catholic-Jewish Dialogue

Shortly after 5:00 p.m., on May 11, 2009 Pope Benedict XVI was led into the Hall of Remembrance at Yad Vashem, a dark room, with a low, concrete ceiling, as the "Ankor" girls' choir sang the Song of a Martyr, and a rabbi chanted El Maleh Rahamim, the traditional Jewish prayer of mourning. The pope spoke briefly with six Holocaust survivors and was then asked to step up to the podium, where he joined Israeli President Shimon Peres, Knesset Speaker Reuven Rivlin, and Rabbi Yisrael Meir Lau, the chairman of the Yad Vashem Council. After claiming that "I have come to stand in silence before the monument erected to honor the millions of Jews killed in the horrific tragedy of the Shoah . . . They lost their lives, but they will never lose their names. These are indelibly etched in the hearts of their loved ones, their surviving fellow prisoners, and all those determined never to allow such an atrocity to disgrace mankind again," the pope laid a wreath over a stone crypt containing the ashes of Holocaust victims.

"As we stand here in silence," the pope continued, "their cry still echoes in our hearts. It is a cry raised against every act of injustice and violence. It is a perpetual reproach against the spilling of innocent blood. . . . I am deeply grateful to God and to you for the opportunity to stand here in silence: a silence to remember, a silence to pray, a silence to hope."

The wreath-laying ceremony at Yad Vashem was the culmination of a trip to Israel that began months earlier, a trip born out of the needs of both the Vatican and the Israeli government. Both the overture leading to the pope's visit to Israel and the filming of Bishop Williamson's "Holocaust denial" in Bavaria took place in November 2008. There were other links as well. As one pundit put it: "The pope's decision on 21 Janaury, four days after the Gaza ceasefire, to lift the excommunication of the Lefebrvrist bishops, including Holocaust-denier Richard Williamson, stirred up such a storm as to make the cancellation of the journey to the Jewish state unthinkable." No matter what the Vatican did to use the visit to leverage its way out of the Williamson affair, the two events were destined to be intertwined forever after. Taken together, both the papal visit to Israel and the Williamson affair were seen as a test of

Vatican II. The lifting of the excommunications of the four SSPX bishops had called into question the Church's commitment to Vatican II, among both progressives in the Church and the Jews, who claimed the right to interpret it as they saw fit. In flying to Israel, the pope was attempting the political and theological equivalent of squaring the circle.

The issue that had been blocking the papal visit to Israel in the months leading up to the Williamson affair was the treatment of Pius XII at Yad Vashem. The Church, including the present pope, had been pressing for the canonization of Pius XII; the Jews, on the other hand, had grown accustomed to referring to him as "Hitler's pope." The caption on Pius XII at Yad Vashem was a mish-mash of tendentious statements all of which were traceable, in spirit, to Rolf Hochhuth's play *The Deputy*:

> In 1933, when he was Secretary of the Vatican State, he was active in obtaining a Concordat with the German regime to preserve the Church's rights in Germany, even if this meant recognizing the Nazi racist regime. When he was elected Pope in 1939, he shelved a letter against racism and anti-Semitism that his predecessor had prepared. Even when reports about the murder of Jews reached the Vatican, the Pope did not protest either verbally or in writing. In December 1942, he abstained from signing the Allied declaration condemning the extermination of the Jews. When Jews were deported from Rome to Auschwitz, the Pope did not intervene. The Pope maintained his neutral position throughout the war, with the exception of appeals to the rulers of Hungary and Slovakia towards its end. His silence and the absence of guidelines obliged Churchmen throughout Europe to decide on their own how to react.

The caption on Pius XII showed that dialogue with the Jews had, if anything, regressed as a result of Vatican II. Before Vatican II, especially between the end of World War II and Pius XII's death in 1958, Jewish leaders were unanimous in their praise of Pius XII's efforts to save Jews from harm. The caption at Yad Vashem was an indication of the revision of holocaust history that had taken place in the wake of Vatican II. Every pope since Pius XII has contested the Jewish calumnies which began with Hochhuth's play—none more vigorously than Pope Paul VI, who knew Pius XII personally—but throughout the dialogue years the Jewish position hardened into a non-negotiable demand.

Nothing changed during the papacy of Benedict XVI. According to Matthew Wagner's account in the *Jerusalem Post*, "The promoter of Pius's cause to beatification, the Jesuit historian Fr. Peter Gumpel, had said the pope would not visit Israel until the caption was changed. And while the Vatican's spokesman distanced Pope Benedict from the statement, a visit seemed like the last thing in the cards." Israel's standing invitation had been put on hold, pending a change in the Pius XII exhibit at Yad Vashem.

Then suddenly the situation changed. Rome wanted the trip to happen, and so an agreement was hammered out whereby the pope would visit Yad Vashem but stay away from the offending caption. Just when the situation changed is a matter of conjecture. Wagner claims that "The moment the opportunity arose, president Peres issued the invitation that was promptly accepted." Anshel Pfeffer claims that the deal was closed in November, but adds that the course of subsequent events only lent an air of urgency to both sides. Pfeffer claims that "The Curia's willingness to accept the Israeli invitation took Mr. Peres by surprise." But it should be just as obvious that Israel's "bloody campaign" against what Pfeffer termed "the Hamas movement in the Gaza Strip" but which the rest of the world saw as the Palestinian people, had created a need for moral credibility that only a papal visit could lend. On the other hand, the need for moral credibility in the wake of the Williamson affair of the sort that only world Jewry could lend in the court of public opinion made the trip equally attractive from the Vatican's point of view. The issue of Pius XII remained a bone of contention, especially because no head of state can visit Israel without stopping off first at Yad Vashem, but diplomacy prevailed. The Pius XII issue was sidestepped when both sides agreed that the pope could skip the museum and its calumny of Pius XII and go directly to the holocaust shrine, where he could lay a wreath at the memorial site.

On February 27, new documents were released showing that Pope Pius XII saved the lives of 80,000 Hungarian Jews, but curiously the Vatican failed to press the advantage which the newly discovered documents gave in resolving the Pius XII issue.[1] As a result, the documents were ignored.

The *Catholic Herald*, which among other papers reported the findings, was, however, busy pushing its pro-Zionist line in the run-up to the pope's visit by publishing hardline Israeli propaganda by Denis Maceoin, a colleague of Daniel Pipes, who told us that "The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has entered a very dark phase since Israel's defensive [*sic*] assault on Gaza at the end of last year. . . . [there is] a swelling international hate-fest against Israel that is now growing into a frightening resurgence of anti-Semitism in many European countries. Everything the pope says and does throughout his visit will be watched and weighed . . ." Maceoin proceeded to lecture the pope from his "Catholic" podium:

> He must denounce Holocaust denial, not as an error in fact, but as a deadly sin against the human soul . . . Israel would also be a perfect place for Benedict to denounce another churchman who has indulged in a similar distortion of the truth. Cardinal Renato Martino, head of the Vatican Council for Justice and Peace, recently bought in to a smaller but equally vicious lie, namely that the people of Gaza live in "a big concentration camp" . . . The Pope must also address the widespread claim that Israel is an "apartheid state."[2]

The same paper's 21 year-old contributing editor, Will Heaven (a protégé of the anti-Palestinian commissar and theologically illiterate *Herald* editor-in-chief Damian Thompson), told readers of the *Jerusalem Post*:

> Hamas in Gaza and the West Bank, and Hizbullah in Lebanon are all under the influence of an Iranian regime that does not recognize Israel's right to exist. And now this regime is moving ever closer [*sic*] to nuclear capability. For Jews, the threat has become existential . . . his prayers at the Western Wall will be just as earnest, and the gesture as profound. It is this yearning for cooperation in the face of new and horrible threats to Israel that must remain a priority.

Such advice, emanating from writers for an "orthodox," "conservative" Catholic paper, suggests that defence of Pope Pius XII is no guarantee of commitment to truth, justice or humility. Yet there were those prepared to defend Pius XII without a trying to bully the pope into adopting their own Zionist fantastical propositions.

At a press conference announcing the release of the new material on Pius XII, Pave the Way Foundation president Gary Krupp said: "Personally, as a Jew, I find that correcting this revision of history according to documented proof has really nothing to do with the Catholic church. In the interest of Jewish justice we must acknowledge the efforts of one man during a period when as a people we were abandoned by the rest of the world. It's time to recognize Pope Pius XII for what he really did rather than what he didn't say."

Pave the Way also published testimony from Lt. Gen. Ion Mihai Pacepa, the highest-ranking KGB agent ever to defect to the West. Pacepa claimed that Hochhuth's play *The Deputy* was financed and edited by the Soviets, and sustained by doctored Vatican documents as part of a KGB plot to discredit the Vatican.

The fact that Krupp and Pave the Way had been invited by none other than Yad Vashem to carry out research into the life of Pius XII cut no ice with Avner Shalev, current director of Yad Vashem, who was evidently unaware of Krupp's discoveries. In an article which appeared in *The Independent* on the eve of Pope Benedict's trip to Israel, Shalev told Donald Macintyre, that nothing new had emerged from the archives, "and in particular papers in the Vatican archive which remain secret after more than six decades. The archives run only up to 1939, and the one volume of records since published by the Vatican on the issue were selected from a huge number of documents."

Pope Pius XII, in other words, remained guilty until proven innocent, a condition imposed on him largely through a work of fiction produced with the collaboration of the KGB and scholarly works like John Cornwall's book *Hitler's Pope* (a work refuted by scholars Pierre Blet, Peter Gumpel, Michael Burleigh, Rabbi Daniel Dalin and others). Shalev conceded that "Towards the end of the war the Pope did appeal to the Slovakian and Hungarian regimes

to halt the deportations. But even his 1942 Christmas message deploring persecution for reasons of faith or race did not mention the Jews—or Poles." In spite of everything, Shalev still planned to welcome the pope to Yad Vashem, where both men planned to ignore the calumnies against Pius XII in the other part of the building in the interest of fostering Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

Instead of dealing with the new revelations about Pius XII, the Jewish press focused instead on the London Conference on anti-Semitism, which began two days after Pave the Way held its press conference. The message of the London confab was predictably dire: "It's a pandemic—not just an epidemic that breaks out somewhere, but a pandemic that's everywhere," Abraham Foxman, head of the ADL told *The Forward* shortly after returning from London. "We haven't seen anything like this since 1945."

The head of the ADL delegation to the "First Global Anti-Semitism confab," was Representative Chris Smith, a Republican and a Catholic from New Jersey, known to most other Catholics for his opposition to abortion. In his closing remarks at the anti-Semitism confab, Congressman Smith pleaded passionately for hate crimes legislation:

> If our fight is to succeed, we need government officials at all levels to denounce, without hestiation or delay, anti-Semitic acts wherever and whenever they occur. No exceptions. The purveyors of hate never take a holiday or grow weary, nor should we. . . . Holocaust remembrance and tolerance education must dramatically expand, and we need to ensure that our respective laws punish those who hate and incite violence against Jews.

The London anti-Semitism confab looked like a classic instance of the spirit of Vatican II and the Catholic-Jewish dialogue spawned by *Nostra Aetate*, which is to say, one more *goy*—in this case, Chris Smith—fronting for the Jewish agenda at the expense of his own constituents. Since Jews are overwhelmingly in favor of abortion, it was not immediately clear how being against abortion and for hate crime legislation fit together. That became clearer in April when the Justice Department and the Department of Homeland Security issued documents demonstrating that the government still considered prolifers as potential terrorists. Hate crimes legislation, as a result, would be used against prolifers, because the government has singled them out in their predicates document. The legacy of Janet Reno's tenure as attorney general lived on, and now a Republican was urging legislation that would make it more likely that his constituents—Catholics and prolifers—would find themselves in legal jeopardy. Smith's performance in London reminded seasoned prolife observers of one of his former colleague in the Senate from the state across the Delaware River, Rick Santorum, whose career ended when Catholics in Pennsylvania decided he was more interested in Israel's welfare than Pennsylvania's. Santorum then became a full-fledged member of the Israel

Lobby working full-time for the American Enterprise Institute, trying to get America to bomb Iran.

The Williamson Affair followed hard on the heels of the Israeli attack on Gaza, an event which sparked outrage throughout the world, an outrage which the ADL and its minions interpreted as anti-Semitism. Missing from Rep. Smith's remarks was any indication that the alleged rise in anti-Semitism was in reality an expression of moral outrage at the Israeli attack on Gaza. The fall-out from Gaza was given the usual spin in the mainstream press: Jewish behavior had nothing to do with anti-Semitism. Writing for *The Boston Globe*, Jeff Jacoby gave the standard explanation, which is that there is no explanation:

> What drives such bloodlust? . . . The Jews . . . had done nothing to justify Haman's murderous anti-Semitism—just as Jews in later ages did nothing that justified their persecution under the Church or Islam or their repression at the hands of the Russian czars and Soviet Commissars, or their slaughter by Nazi Germany. . . . The paranoid frenzy that is anti-Semitism is not explained by what Jews do, but by what they are. They are the object of anti-Semitism, not its cause. . . . What do those who vilify Jews as greedy bankers have in common with those who revile them as fiendish Bolsheviks? Nothing, save an irrational obsession with Jews.

The reference to a link between "greedy bankers' and "fiendish Bolsheviks" sounds irrational and conspiratorial, unless, of course, we look into the life of banker Jacob Schiff and his support of Bolshevism, at which point the link turns out to be true. But no matter.

Mr. Jacoby could tell the *goyim* that it was all "paranoid frenzy" and "irrational obsession," but many Jews weren't so sure. The Jewish press was claiming that the "recent war in Gaza" as well as "the current financial crisis, with Jews like Bernie Madoff regrettably among the swindlers" was "fueling the anti-Semitism."[3] "The idea of linking global anti-Semitism to the vagaries of Israeli-Palestinian relations," the *Star* continued, "has been all but taboo in Jewish community discourse for years." But obviously it was no longer, and that too contributed to the convergence of interests that helped make the papal trip to Israel a reality.

FALLOUT FROM GAZA

The fallout from the Gaza incursion made Israel even more eager than the Vatican for a papal visit and the moral legitimacy it conferred. The Williamson affair may have driven the pictures of the devastation in Gaza off the front page and created a new news cycle which conveniently portrayed the Jews as victims, but the issue of Jewish guilt remained in need of expiation, at least in the court of public opinion, and the papal visit seemed ready made to accomplish that.

One Christian in the Holy Land made his position about Israel and the Pope crystal clear before the visit. "Pope Benedict is not welcome in the Holy Land in the present circumstances," said Archbishop Theodosius of Sebaste, the highest ranking native Palestinian Christian clergyman in Jerusalem, after it was announced in Israel that the head of the Church of Rome was planning to begin his May pilgrimage to the Holy City with obeisance to the Jewish Holocaust Memorial Yad Vashem.

"We are not against the Pope's visit to Yad Vashem, but before expressing solidarity with the Jews, he should show solidarity with the Christians of Palestine. We have our own tragic memories; our Yad Vashem is in Gaza," said the Archbishop, and then added: "let the Pope begin his visit with Gaza first."

"If the Pope wants to come to the Holy Land, he should begin the visit by coming to the local Catholic church in Gaza", said Archbishop Theodosius Atallah Hanna. "The church was denied visits by the priests and bishops, and Gazan Christians were unable to worship in Jerusalem and Bethlehem. At first, the Pope should meet with Palestinian Christians, who carry the light of Christ in the darkness of Israeli occupation. Otherwise, this is not a visit to us, but a visit to Israel, an item on the Pope's agenda vis-à-vis the Jewish organizations. We ask the Pope to speak for the people of Palestine, for Palestinian Christians are part and parcel of Palestine. Palestinian Christians suffer together with their Muslim brothers. Let the Pope advocate our cause," he said.[4]

The need for expiation was just as great among the Catholics, largely because the Williamson affair had called a number of issues that had been taken for granted into question. The main issue which the Williamson affair called into question was the status of Catholic-Jewish dialogue, which was based on the Jewish reading of *Nostra Aetate* in particular and Vatican II in general. According to Mark Weitzman's reading of Church history:

> At Vatican II, the church rejected centuries of Christian anti-Semitism. The church's historically anti-Semitic theology . . . induced the charges that Jews were responsible for the crucifixion and were thus eternally cursed. These theological positions helped create an environment that nourished violence and discrimination that lasted into the 20th century, and ultimately contributed to the Holocaust. It was Vatican II, particularly through the document *Nostra Aetate*, that finally broke with that tradition. The document states that Jews today cannot be blamed for the death of Jesus and said that the church "decries hatred, persecutions, displays of anti-Semitism, directed against Jews at any time and by anyone.[5]

As Weitzman makes clear, the real issue is tradition. According to the Jewish reading of Vatican II, the Catholic Church redeemed itself only after it broke

with tradition. If the Church were to return to those traditions, she would be ratifying the validity of "centuries of Christian anti-Semitism." This is the issue at the heart of the Williamson Affair and the reason why the Jews were so upset about the possibility of the re-integration of the traditionalist movement back into the Church. When Weitzman, who is director of the Simon Wiesenthal Center's Task Force against Hate, talked about the SSPX's "desire to turn back the clock," he was talking not about a particular period of history, but referring to the fact that the Church's fundamental documents contradict the principles of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. Catholic-Jewish dialogue has created a situation in which the Catholic Church is at odds with itself. That that divided state is congenial to Jewish interests is not surprising in light of the Church's foundational documents. As St. Thomas Aquinas put it in his *Commentary on Galatians*: "From the beginning of the early Church the Jews persecuted Christians, as is obvious in the Acts of the Apostles, and they would do the same even now, if they were able." The main way in which Jews now persecute the Church is by getting Catholics to internalize the Jewish reading of Vatican II, a reading which cuts Catholics off from each other and from their traditions and seminal documents. Catholic-Jewish dialogue, in other words, is the main instrument which Jews use to persecute the Church. Weitzman makes this clear in his article:

> The acceptance of Vatican II . . . must require a commitment to a renewed theology of dialogue that respects Jews and Jewish self-determination and embraces the documents and teachings that have circulated from the Vatican and the Catholic Church over the almost half a century since *Nostra Aetate* was published. . . . The commitment to building this relationship must be *internalized*, so that it would not require the intervention of a German chancellor or thousands of outraged Catholics and Jews for the church to recognize the obvious (my emphasis).

In the aftermath of the Williamson affair it became clear that many Catholics, including many Catholic bishops, had done exactly what Weitzman ordered them to do; they had internalized the Jewish reading of Vatican II. Accepting the Jewish interpretation of World War II had become a "religious obligation" for Catholics. In a Catholic News Service article which appeared the *Catholic Universe Bulletin* in the wake of the Williamson affair, Cindy Wooden claimed that

> Denying the Holocaust is a sign of not understanding the reality of evil and "therefore not living the faith," Jesuit Father Federico Lombardi, the papal spokesman said, "For this reason, it seems right to me that a bishop who denies the Shoah is better off growing potatoes or doing anything else, but not being a bishop."[6]

Catholics, according to Wooden, need to understand that the Catholic Church was one of the most wicked institutions in all of human history, and only

lately redeemed from that wickedness by "internalizing" the Jewish reading of Vatican II, or as Rabbi David Rosen, chairman of the International Catholic-Jewish Liaison Committee, put it: "there is a well-documented connection between centuries of Christian teaching of contempt for the Jews—blaming them for the death of Christ—and the atmosphere that allowed the Nazis' attempts to destroy European Jewry to nearly succeed."

In response to the Williamson affair Cardinal Sean P. O'Malley of Boston brought Walter Cardinal Kasper to Boston to bless a Menorah which was being moved to the new chancery office. As part of the ceremonies surrounding the blessing, O'Malley called the Holocaust "the greatest act of inhumanity ever perpetrated on this planet." He then claimed that the ceremony at which Cardinal Kasper officiated was intended to "to assure the entire community of the Holy Father and the church's commitment to furthering these wonderful relationships that have been cultivated [*sic*] the last decades."

No one has internalized the Jewish reading of Vatican II more thoroughly than Bishop Richard Sklba of Milwaukee. In his own take on the Williamson affair, Sklba took the logic of Catholic-Jewish dialogue to its logical conclusion by denying the historical accuracy of the Gospels: "The hostile arguments as recounted in the Gospels give the distinct impression of [Jews as] stubborn resisters to God's grace and to the salvation offered by Jesus of Nazareth. It is not, however, an accurate picture of those religious leaders." According to "Notes On the Correct Way to Present the Jews and Judaism in Preaching and Catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church" (1985) and in statements from our USCCB such as "God's Mercy Endures Forever: Guidelines on the Presentation of Jews and Judaism in Catholic Preaching" (1988) and "Criteria for the Evaluation of Dramatizations of the Passion (1988)" (the document, it should be noted, which led the USCCB to condemn Mel Gibson's film *The Passion of the Christ* as anti-Semitic), "Judaism as such should never be presented in a negative light nor should the Pharasaic movement ever be falsely characterized as narrow, legalistic, or harsh." This means, of course, that the Catholic Church, if it wants to be true to the principles of Catholic-Jewish dialogue, would have to condemn Our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ for all of the bad things he had to say about the Pharisees and their religion.

In one of his less fervid moments, Bishop Sklba intimates that the Williamson affair was payback for recent events:

> Unfortunately, there have been several recent events which caused accumulated alarm in their hearts: the changes in the annual Good Friday prayer for the Jewish people as incorporated in the 1962 Missal of John XXIII, the rewording of a neuraligic sentence regarding the Jewish covenant in the United States Catholic Catechism for Adults, and now the lifting of the ban of excommunication for this individual who is viewed as more than a little wacky as he dismisses the historical nature of the tragic reality of the Holocaust, or Shoah as we prefer to call it.[7]

"Jewish leaders," the ever clueless Bishop Sklba informs us, "become very uneasy if they see hints of changes in the inter-religious atmosphere." And well they might. If those changes led Catholics to embrace the Gospels, it would mean an end to Jewish control over the Catholic mind. The crucial issues are Vatican II and tradition. The Catholics who have internalized the Jewish interpretation of *Nostra Aetate* find themselves cut off from their roots in both Scripture and Tradition. By promoting Catholic-Jewish dialogue the Church has lost control of its own texts and has given the Jews veto power over Church policy, something that became apparent when the Jews demanded that the pope re-excommunicate Bishop Williamson. The pope did not comply, but the Jews felt that *Nostra Aetate* had given them the right to order the pope around. "What is perplexing," wrote Dennis Prager, "is that the moment Williamson's big lie and Jew-hatred became known, the revocation of his excommunication was not halted or reversed. An excommunicated priest who denies the Holocaust should automatically remain excommunicated. Would a priest who denied that Jesus was crucified have his excommunication rescinded?"[8]

More perplexing was the claim that the Holocaust had succeeded the crucifixion as a dogma of the Catholic Faith. Even more perplexing was the question of who had given a theological ignoramus like Dennis Prager the right to order the pope around? The answer to that question is Catholic-Jewish dialogue. The Jewish reading of *Nostra Aetate*, which had been internalized by many Catholics, had turned every Jew into a pope, or, better, a super-Pope, who had the right to order the Pope of Rome around. The Jews were now claiming that the Church had to be run according to their principles. The pope had to expel from the Church anyone who refused to accept their Talmud. Good standing in the Church is now dependent upon acceptance of Jewish "dogma," as exemplified by the Holocaust. The most frightening aspect is how many Catholics were willing to go along with what Prager was urging.

This came out when *Commonweal*, the flagship of liberal Americanism, weighed in with its response to the Williamson affair.[9] A return to tradition of the sort allegedly threatened by the SSPX would not only cause the collapse of Catholic-Jewish relations, it would threaten the liberal take-over of the Church which had been justified according to the "spirit of Vatican II." The liberals, who had been using Vatican II to advance their agenda, needed the Jews to disqualify the traditionalist objections to their regime, and nothing disqualified objections quicker than the charge of anti-Semitism. Hence, Donahue's claim: "The traditionalist view of the society which was founded by Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre in 1970 in opposition to the decrees and reforms of Vatican II are well known, and anti-Semitism is in its DNA."

The Jews could use the liberals to create a fifth column within the Church, but, just as importantly, the liberals could use the Jews to give credibility to

the failing modernist project by demonizing their opponents and anyone who took tradition seriously as anti-Semites. The Church has been cut off from its roots, but the Church's relation with the Jews is the instrument that did the cutting.

From the point of view of the Liberal Catholic-Jewish alliance, everything was fine until the pope composed the new Good Friday prayer, because the prayer bespoke a return to sources that had been repudiated. "This formulation," Donahue informs us in his *Commonweal* article, "continued to be met with serious reservations," largely because it called into question the dual covenant theology that had become the norm in ecclesial circles in America. As Father James Massa told the late Tom Herron, "no one believes in supersessionism anymore." No one but the pope, that is, when he reformulated the Good Friday prayer which prayed for the Jews' conversion. When the pope wrote, "May the Lord Our God enlighten their hearts so that they may acknowledge Jesus Christ, the savior of all men," he offended, according to Donahue,

> Jewish groups and Catholic leaders [who] objected to the use of terms such as "veil" and "blindness," seeing in them a return to a theology of naïve supersessionism that the council had decisively moved the church beyond. (It should also be noted that historically, Good Friday services, with their dramatic recitation of Christ's crucifixion, often prompted violent attacks on Jews.)

Donahue's invocation of the Vatican council is instructive. Far from moving beyond "supersessionism," *Nostra Aetate* affirms it when it claims "that the Church is the new people of God." Even Donahue, who feels that there is "No reason . . . why the prayer from the Reformed Rite of Paul VI—'that they may continue to grow in the love of his name and in faithfulness to his covenant. Almighty and eternal God, long ago you gave your promise to Abraham and his posterity'—was not used, is astute enough to see that it is deliberately ambiguous and can be used to contradict one of the fundamental assertions of the CDF declaration *Dominus Jesus* and, hence, the Catholic Faith, namely, that "Jesus Christ has a significance and value for the human race and its history which are unique and singular, proper to him alone, exclusive, universal and absolute."

The return to tradition implicit in the pope's new prayer threatened the Catholic-Jewish alliance at the heart of the current ecclesial regime. The Williamson affair exposed, as well, the dual identity of the document known as *Nostra Aetate*. When looked at from a theological point of view, *Nostra Aetate* is a valid document flawed by ambiguity. When looked at from the point of view of the historical circumstances surrounding its inception, however, *Nostra Aetate* has to be seen for what it was, namely, a black operation orchestrated by Jules Isaac and the major Jewish organization with Malachi Martin functioning as their paid agent.[10] It was from this darker side that the project of Catholic-Jewish dialogue emerged.

On March 17, Shmuel Rabinovitch, the rabbi in charge of access to the Wailing Wall, announced that the pope would have to remove his crucifix if he wanted to pray there. When Rabinovitch was reminded that Pope John Paul II had not removed his cross when he had prayed there, the rabbi responded that in the meantime the dialogue bar had been raised. Rabinovitch pointed out that in November 2007 he had prevented a delegation of Austrian bishops from praying at the wall when they refused to remove their crucifixes. In May of 2008 he had succeed in preventing a group of Irish bishops from praying there as well. Denying the pope access to the Wailing Wall if he refused to remove his cross was another fruit of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. Measures like this were justified, according to Rabinovitch, because "crosses are a symbol that hurt Jewish feelings."[11]

The papal visit took place under this cloud of calculated insult and undefined terms like "Holocaust denial," "anti-Semitism," and "tradition." It often seemed that the point of the visit was to smooth over issues that were too contentious to be dealt with forthrightly. In spite of the Catholic attempt to gloss over anything the Jews might find offensive, the contentious issues remained beneath the surface and threatened to do damage at any point when discourse strayed from scripts that were predictable and superficial.

The pope wanted to preserve Vatican II and one of the main projects it had launched, namely, Catholic-Jewish dialogue, while also healing the schism which this break with tradition had engendered with the SSPX. The Jews, for their part, were trying to use Catholic-Jewish dialogue to maneuver the pope into repudiating the Gospel, as the Crucifix/Wailing Wall incident had shown. The question was how far would the pope go. The ambiguity in the terms lent ambiguity to the gestures the pope made.

Kreuz.net, the traditionalist German website, brought up the issue of idolatry. If, as Kreuz.net was claiming, the Holocaust had become another religion, would some official ceremony honoring the Holocaust be tantamount to offering incense to idols? In its March 25 article, "*Papstbesuch and der Holocaust-Kultstaette*," Kreuz.net wrote:

> The Holocaust Memorial at Yad Vashem has become a new Mecca. Every politician who aspires to be someone in his party, his country or in the world at large, must go in pilgrimage there. . . . In their cult of death, Yad Vashem celebrates the resurrection of the people and state of Israel, and by going there we celebrate with them a new Easter. . . . The symbolic meaning of this passage to the holy place of the Holocaust is impossible to underestimate. . . . The mass media understand these steps often enough as a form of recognition of the Holocaust-Religion by the Holy Father. . . . The weakness of Christianity creates a vacuum which the Holocaust religion then fills with ease.

As further proof that the Holocaust is a false religion inimical to Christianity, Kreuz.net mentioned the Williamson affair and the fact that the Jews "consider such questions [i.e., how many Jews died and how they died during World War II] *sacrilegious*, and are willing to persecute those who ask them without mercy."[12]

The questions raised at Kreuz.net led to still more questions. What mandate does the pope have in dealing with the Jews? The only mandate is the Scriptures, in particular the Acts of the Apostles, and tradition. Was the pope then, like his predecessor Peter, going to tell the Jews that they had killed Christ, as Peter had done in the Acts of the Apostles?

Expectations were running in the opposite direction. The Jews were hoping that the pope would repudiate the Gospel, and tell them that they could be saved without embracing Christ. At a meeting of religious leaders representing the local Muslim, Catholic, Jewish and Protestant communities at the Notre Dame Cultural Center in Jerusalem on Thursday, April 30, Dr. Deborah Weissman, co-chairman of the Interreligious Coordination Council, said she hoped that Benedict's "ambivalence" on theological issues affecting Jews would be clarified. "The pope still had not made it absolutely clear that Jews did not need to embrace the belief that Jesus was the messiah to be redeemed," she said.[13]

Given expectations like this, it was hard to see what the pope was going to accomplish. On the eve of Pope Benedict's arrival in Amman, John Allen wrote that some might declare the trip a success "If he simply gets back to Rome without starting a war."[14]

Many Muslims were not happy with the trip. The Islamicist movement called for a boycott of the Pope's visit, claiming that the "words against Muhammad" in the Pope's 2006 Regensburg address, "were a crime in the full meaning of the word." The Muslims had a right to be annoyed, not because of the quote from Manuel Paleologos IV, but because the double standard which found expression in the pope's visit to Cologne shortly after ascending to the throne of Peter was still in place, even if it had been diplomatically muted. The papal trip exposed the incoherence in the Church's position vis-a-vis non-Christian religions.

The pope chose to begin his trip in Amman, Jordan. During his address at the Al-Hussein Bin Talal mosque, he said essentially the same things he had said during the Regensburg speech, minus the quote which the Muslim world found so offensive. The pope reiterated his claim that Christianity was the religion of Logos when he said: "Christians in fact describe God, among other ways, as creative Reason, which orders and guides the world. And God endows us with the capacity to participate in his reason and thus to act in accordance with what is good." The implication, though unstated, was that Islam was not amenable to Logos, when he claimed immediately thereafter: "Muslims worship God, the Creator of Heaven and Earth, who has spoken

groveling in its obsequiousness, merited only rebuff from the Jews, who felt that the pope hadn't apologized enough or abased himself enough in the face of Jewish suffering and, therefore, moral superiority. To his credit, the pope called for an independent Palestinian homeland in a speech he gave minutes after landing at Israel's Ben Gurion International Airport on May 11: "I plead with all those responsible to explore every possible avenue in the search for a just resolution of the outstanding difficulties, so that both peoples may live in peace in a homeland of their own, within secure and internationally recognized borders."

But there was no finger-wagging about Logos when the pope dealt with the Jews, who responded not with hospitality but by giving the impression that no matter what the pope said it was not enough. In his May 9 speech at the Franciscan Basilica of the Memorial of Moses atop Mount Nebo, Pope Benedict reminded everyone "of the inseparable bond between the Church and the Jewish people."

The Jews reacted by saying it would have been better if the pope had stayed home. Before long it became clear that he could never overcome the religious and racial animus the Jews held against him. In an article in *The Sunday Times* on May 10, "General Giora Eiland, the former head of Israel's national security council, reflected the views of many Israelis. 'It would have been better if the visit wasn't taking place,' he said. 'The Pope's service in the Wehrmacht is a stain.'"[15] There were, of course, Muslim clerics who felt the same way and urged the faithful to stay away from papal events, but those feelings seemed to be the rule rather than the exception among Israelis. According to the same article,

> Dov Lior, the hardline chief rabbi of Hebron in the West Bank, called on his followers "not to participate in any event or show respect to the Pope." He also asked members of the Knesset, Israel's parliament, who are affiliated to his religious party to boycott the visit. Michael Ben-Ari, a Knesset member, said the visit would be an insult to the memory of Holocaust victims. Referring to the rehabilitation of Williamson, he said: "This Pope brought back to the church priests who deny the Holocaust and has renewed discussion on the accusation that Jews murdered Jesus."

By the time the pope made his long-anticipated trip to Yad Vashem, the bar of Jewish expectation had been raised to an impossibly high level. Not one jot or tittle of the calumny against Pius XII had been changed. Not only had any attempt at rehabilitating the memory of Pius XII been long forgotten, it was clear that to placate the Jews, the pope would have to do nothing less than repudiate the Gospel, as well as insult the memory of his German ancestors. Forty-some years of Catholic-Jewish dialogue had led the Jews to expect nothing less. The chorus of carping had begun before the pope had opened his mouth, and it emanated not from the mouths of a few malcontents sought

ought by the media, but from the very host of the event. Before the pope had a chance to utter a word, Yisrael Meir Lau, chairman of the Yad Vashem council in charge of the memorial, said he planned to ask Benedict: "Why did he lift the excommunication of Richard Williamson, a Holocaust-denying bishop? And why did the Vatican not join Israel, the United States and other nations last month in boycotting a United Nations conference on racism that critics say was used to malign the Jewish state?"

When the pope failed to accommodate Jewish expectations that chorus swelled into an ugly roar of denunciation. The pope was barely out of the hall when Rabbi Lau, the man who had invited him and had shared a podium with him, denounced his guest. "There certainly was no apology expressed here," said Lau. "Something was missing. There was no mention of the Germans," then as if catching himself in a racial *faux pas*, Lau continued, "or the Nazis who participated in the butchery, nor a word of regret. . . . I personally missed hearing a tone of sharing the grief. I missed hearing 'I'm sorry, I apologize.' If not an apology, then an expression of remorse." Yad Vashem chairman Avner Shalev concurred: "I did not expect an apology, but we expected more," he told the *Jerusalem Post*. "This is certainly no historic landmark."

John Allen of the *National Catholic Reporter*, joined in the chorus, faulting the pope for what he didn't say:

> For one thing, there's no explicit expression of regret for Christian anti-Semitism, no allusion to the role that currents of thought within Christianity about Jews and Judaism may have played in preparing the soil for the Holocaust. . . . In Benedict's address today, there was also no direct reference to the recent controversy involving Bishop Richard Williamson, a member of the breakaway traditionalist society of St. Pius X, whose excommunication, along with three other traditionalist prelates, was recently lifted by Pope Benedict. That act became a cause célèbre because Williamson has a long record of minimizing the Holocaust, including the assertion that the Nazis did not use gas chambers and that far fewer than six million Jews died in the Holocaust.[16]

The only thing that would have satisfied the Jews, in other words, was the spectacle of the pope denouncing his own religion. Or, as Rabbi David Rosen, a man whom Allen characterized as "a longtime veteran of Jewish-Catholic dialogue" and one of the "longtime Jewish friends of the Catholic Church," put it, "it's disappointing that he didn't use this opportunity to go further, and acknowledge the tragic connection between the teaching of contempt [i.e., the Gospel of St. John, the Acts of the Apostles, and the writings of Church Fathers like St. John Chrysostom] and Jewish suffering."

The reaction on Israeli TV was even more negative. One pundit complained that the pope "spoke of the Jews as being 'killed' rather than 'murdered,' noting there were 'millions' but did not say 'six.'" According to Deborah

Lipstadt, what the pope said qualified him as a Holocaust denier, at a slightly lower level, albeit than Bishop Williamson. "Some commentators," Pfeffer continued, "felt that the Pope also seemed to equate those who are being persecuted today to the victims of the Holocaust."[17]

CHORUS OF OPPROBRIUM

The chorus of opprobrium continued to swell. One day after the visit to Yad Vashem, the *Jerusalem Post* reported extensively on the pope's speech, and all of it was negative. Knesset speaker Reuven Rivlin, who also shared the dais with the pope as co-host, joined in the denunciations: "We're talking about the pope, who is also a representative of the Holy See, which has a lot to ask forgiveness from our people for," Knesset Speaker Reuven Rivlin said during an interview on Israel Radio. "And he is also a German, whose country and people have asked forgiveness. But he himself comes and speaks to us like a historian, as an observer, as a man who expresses his opinion about things that should never happen, and he was—what can you do?—a part of them." "If we let this go, in the end they'll say, 'the Jewish people can manage,'" the Knesset speaker said.

Rivlin added "there is one thing which is forbidden to forget, and we must not allow ourselves to forget it, not even in the act of giving up on it in one way or another due to protocol. The Holocaust is not protocol." After the pope's speech, the Knesset speaker—who was absent from all of the welcoming festivities other than the visit to Yad Vashem—said that "everything that we feared came to fruition." "I came to the memorial not only to hear historical descriptions or about the established fact of the Holocaust. I came as a Jew, hoping to hear an apology and a request for forgiveness from those who caused our tragedy, and among them, the Germans and the church. But to my sadness, I did not hear any such thing," he said.

"The visit to Yad Vashem does not constitute an expression of regret as such," added Rivlin. "The eyes of Jews across the world, and of the nation in Israel, were directed here, in anticipation of hearing honest communion—personal and determined—regarding the Holocaust of their people. And we heard nothing of the sort."[18]

Like John Allen, Tom Segev in *Ha'aretz* criticized the pope for not apologizing for "Christian anti-Semitism" in his Yad Vashem speech. According to Segev, "No church bell would cease to ring had the pontiff said something about Christian anti-Semitism, even if he fell short of explicitly saying that without it, the Nazis would not have won the support of the German people." Segev was evidently unaware that the pope had repudiated the "Christian anti-Semitism/Teaching of Contempt" link with Nazism years earlier when he laid the blame for the Holocaust at the feet of a "neo-pagan ideology." Or perhaps Segev felt that the bar of Catholic-Jewish dialogue had

been raised so high that the pope had to denounce his own Church and his own countrymen as the only way of fulfilling Jewish expectation.

Segev also expressed dismay that "in last night's speech, [the pope] inexplicably said Jews 'were killed,' as if it had been an unfortunate accident. . . ." Segev saw some dark significance in this fact: "the word the pope used is significant because someone in the Holy See decided to write 'were killed' instead of 'murdered' or 'destroyed.'" What follows is a scenario that could have been taken from *The DaVinci Code*:

> The impression is that the cardinals argued among themselves over whether Israelis "deserve" for the pope to say "were murdered" and decided they only deserve "were killed." It sounded petty. Even the recurring use of the term "tragedy" seemed like an attempt to avoid saying the real thing.

All in all, Segev concluded, the pope's speech was full of "verbal stinginess" and "empty banalities."

As we have come to expect of Germans, *Der Spiegel*, which had led the lynch mob in Germany against both the pope and Bishop Williamson, outdid the Israelis in its criticism:

> Criticism didn't just come from Israel, either. In Germany, the Central Council of Jews in Germany blasted the pope for failing to more clearly distance himself from the Society of St. Pius X and the Holocaust denial of SSPX Bishop Richard Williamson. "What should one think of a public call to fight against anti-Semitism when he himself doesn't act and doesn't take consequences," said Stephan Kramer, general secretary of the Central Council. Council President Charlotte Knobloch said "I expected clearer words from the pope at Yad Vashem."

Der Spiegel faulted the pope for making no mention of Bishop Williamson. The same magazine which has taken up the banner of Berthold Brecht's *Galileo* in excoriating the Church as the last bastion of unenlightened bigotry in the modern world, gave the impression that no anathema the Church could have applied to Williamson would have been strong enough to satisfy the moral indignation of the German people, an indignation which far exceeded that of the Israelis themselves.

In the eyes of *Der Spiegel*, Pope Benedict XVI was a disgrace to the *Vaterland*, which now saw groveling before the same groups they rounded up and sent to concentration camps as constituting virtuous behavior. As if that weren't bad enough, the pope's English needed work too:

> he rattled off the sentences as if unaware of the impact of his words, swallowing and mumbling important words, as if he were reading a manuscript meant for someone else or, even more distressingly, as if he were unaware of what he was reading. It was not a powerful moment. There were no sparks.[19]

The pope would have had to denounce the Catholic Church as the most wicked institution in human history if he expected to get a respectful hearing from the Jews. David Cesarini saw the speech at Yad Vashem as

> a re-run of his visit to Auschwitz in May 2006, when he contrived to avoid any acknowledgment that Christianity itself bred antisemitism and that Germans, as well as others, voluntarily and often enthusiastically robbed, tortured and slaughtered Jews by the million [*sic*] between 1933 and 1945. . . .

When Pope Benedict XVI visited Auschwitz on May 28, 2006, he spoke personally as "a son of the German people":

> I could not fail to come here. I had to come. It is a duty before the truth and the just due of all who suffered here, a duty before God, for me to come here as the successor of Pope John Paul II and as a son of the German people – a son of that people over which a ring of criminals rose to power by false promises of future greatness and the recovery of the nation's honor, prominence and prosperity, but also through terror and intimidation, with the result that our people was used and abused as an instrument of their thirst for destruction and power. . . . The God in whom we believe is a God of reason – a reason, to be sure, which is not a kind of cold mathematics of the universe, but is one with love and with goodness. We make our prayer to God and we appeal to humanity, that this reason, the logic of love and the recognition of the power of reconciliation and peace, may prevail over the threats arising from irrationalism or from a spurious and godless reason.

It's hard to discern self-exculpation in that speech, but that's precisely what Cesarini perceived, because

> when it came to doctrine and the culpability of the church for modern anti-Semitism, his own conservatism and the reactionaries within the curia made it impossible to take the steps that Jews longed for. . . . For these reasons, to Jews the record of the Catholic establishment is indelibly stained with, at worst, active collaboration or, at best, a passive acquiescence in the persecution and mass murder of Europe's Jews. Until it acknowledges this complicity, relations between the two faiths will always be compromised. It may be generations, if ever, before the Roman Catholic church is able to look into its soul and to accept its responsibility for cultivating the climate of hate and the theological rationalisations that contributed so heavily towards the genocide against the Jews.

One day later, on May 12, the pope met with the Ashkenazi and Sephardic chief rabbis in a meeting that epitomized Catholic-Jewish dialogue in a way that neither the pope nor the rabbis intended. In a moment that seemed straight out of an Evelyn Waugh novel, Rabbi Yona Metzger began his presentation

by thanking the pope for excommunicating Bishop Williamson. There may have been a translation problem, although the expression that came over the pope's face when the translation from the Hebrew was whispered in his ear indicated that he was as surprised as everyone else to learn that the lifting of the excommunications was now being reported as their imposition.

Continuing in the same vein, Rabbi Metzger went on to thank the pope for his "historic agreement and the commitment given by the Vatican, that the Church will henceforth desist from all missionary and conversion activities amongst our people. This is for us an immensely important message." When asked about the fact that the pope had now officially denied the Gospel, Vatican spokesman Federico ("never, never, never") Lombardi "told reporters later he was not sure what document the rabbi was talking about."

Whatever. When it comes to Catholic-Jewish dialogue, popes have learned that they should not complain when the rabbis put words in their mouths. If what happened in Jerusalem were true dialogue, the pope should have jumped up and shouted, "That's a lie. I never said anything like that. The pope cannot not preach the conversion of the Jews. If he did, he would be denying the Gospel." The pope, of course, said nothing of the kind. He remained silent throughout Metzger's diatribe. Benedict XVI responded to Metzger's misrepresentations by praising the fruits of Catholic-Jewish dialogue and insisting that the Church was "irrevocably committed" to its continuation in perpetuity:

> Today I have the opportunity to repeat that the Catholic Church is irrevocably committed to the path chosen at the Second Vatican Council for a genuine and lasting reconciliation between Christians and Jews. As the Declaration *Nostra Aetate* makes clear, the Church continues to value the spiritual patrimony common to Christians and Jews and desires an ever deeper mutual understanding and respect through biblical and theological studies as well as fraternal dialogues. May the seven Bilateral Commission meetings which have already taken place between the Holy See and the Chief Rabbinate stand as evidence! I am thus grateful for your reciprocal assurance that the relationship between the Catholic Church and the Chief Rabbinate will continue to grow in respect and understanding in the future.

Respect and understanding? Let's put "respect" aside for a moment and forget about the torrent of abuse which followed on the heels of the pope's address at Yad Vashem, as well as the calumnious insult, still there, to the memory of Pius XII. Let's concentrate on the "understanding" part. When have the Jews shown even a remote understanding of the Catholic Faith? When has anything they have said been anything other than a tendentious misrepresentation of the Catholic position? Remember we are talking about the chief Ashkenazi

rabbi in Jerusalem here and not some poor schmuck a TV reporter picked up for a sound bite. Where is the understanding in Rabbi Metzger's remarks?

Catholic-Jewish dialogue is not only a waste of time and a source of constant disinformation, it is also contrary to Scripture. If anything, the meeting between the pope and the rabbis in Jerusalem made perfectly clear that the only kind of "dialogue" that will satisfy Jews like Rabbi Metzger is a repudiation of the Gospels. If the Catholics proponents of dialogue are too obtuse to see this, then they should listen more closely to what their "elder brothers" are actually saying. Before he puts the Church on the path of being "irrevocably committed" to Catholic-Jewish dialogue, the pope should consider listening to Reform Rabbi Jonathan Romain, who wrote a piece entitled "The Pope's Jewish Dilemma" in the May 8 number of the the *Guardian*. Romain's point is not complicated. As he sees it, the pope's dilemma arose as a result of the "religious revolution" which "occurred through Vatican II." According to Romain, the pope can have dialogue with the Jews or he can remain "loyal to the Gospels," but he can't do both:

> Vatican II may indeed have sought to develop a new theology . . . but it is undermined every day when believers read the text of the Gospels declaring that Jews are damned or that one can only come to the father through the son. Unless a new Vatican II version of the New Testament is printed, with difficult passages omitted or explained away, there will always be a huge gulf between what the scriptures teach and what the modern church claims to teach.

This "underlying tension" surfaces periodically in crises like the Williamson affair or the on-going battle over the canonization of Pius XII, but it is ultimately traceable to the untenable position the Church put itself into when it embarked upon the path of dialogue with the Jews. Romain's essay points up the incoherence in the Vatican's current policy:

> The real conundrum that faces Benedict XVI on his visit to Israel. . . [is] should he be loyal to the Gospels which claim that only acceptance of Christ can bring the messianic age, or should he endorse Vatican II which acknowledges that Jews . . . can find the kingdom of God via a different route? Should he look inwards, backwards or forwards?

What Romain proposes as a conundrum is no conundrum at all. The pope must be "loyal to the Gospels." But Romain's logic is otherwise impeccable. Since the pope must be loyal to the gospel, he must abandon the failed experiment known as dialogue with the Jews.

The only theologically based mandate for dialogue with the Jews is found in the Acts of the Apostles, when Peter addresses the men of Jerusalem in the wake of the Pentecost:

> Men of Israel, listen to what I am going to say. Jesus the Nazarene was a man commended to you by God by the miracles and portents and signs that God worked through him when he was among you, as you all know. This man, who was put into your power by the deliberate intention and foreknowledge of God, you took and had crucified by men outside the Law. You killed him, but God raised him to life. . . . For this reason, the whole House of Israel can be certain that God has made this Jesus whom you crucified both Lord and Christ.[20]

When Pope Benedict's predecessor spoke to the Jews in that manner, the Jews were "cut to the heart" and asked Peter and the Apostles, "What must we do, brothers?"

Peter's answer was clear. Instead of telling the Jews that the Church was "irrevocably committed" to "ever deeper mutual understanding and respect through biblical and theological studies as well as fraternal dialogues" as well as "the seven Bilateral Commission meetings which have already taken place between the Holy See and the Chief Rabbinate," Benedict's predecessor Peter told the Jews: "You must repent, and every one of you must be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the Holy Spirit. The promise that was made is for you and your children, and for all those who are far away, for all those whom the Lord Our God will call to himself."

Peter spoke to the Jews "for a long time using many arguments and he urged them, 'Save yourselves from this perverse generation.'" And how did the Jews react? Did they complain because Peter accused them of killing Christ? Did they quibble over the use of "murdered" versus "killed"? Did they complain about his pronunciation of the Greek? Did they complain because he didn't mention the sins committed by Christians against Jews? Did they say that he should have stayed home? No, quite to the contrary, "They were convinced by his arguments, and they accepted what he said and were baptized." In fact, "That very day about three thousand were added to their number."

PREACHING THE GOSPEL

If the pope does not say something like this in some recognizable form when he meets with the Jews, then he is not preaching the Gospel. And if he is not preaching the Gospel, then his words, no matter how noble in intention they may be, will have no effect, because the Gospel is the only mandate this or any other pope has.

When Joseph Ratzinger became a priest, he foreclosed a number of options previously available to him. When he became pope, he foreclosed still more. One of them, according to traditional usage, was the use of the word "I" in formal discourse. From the moment he ascended to the throne of Peter, the pope spoke as "we," as symbolic of his absorption into the Church as its visible

head on earth. There is only one mandate that that man can call his own, and that is the mandate of the Gospels. His only mandate was the one which Peter chose in the Acts of the Apostles. Can anyone in his right mind think that Benedict was following the mandate established by Peter when he went to Jerusalem and addressed the Jews of his day?

To those who object that St. Peter's comments were heavily context-dependent, let us remind ourselves how St. Pope Pius X dealt the Jewish question as represented in his meeting with founding father of Zionism. When Theodore Herzl put forward his case for Zionism in the hope of gaining the pope's support, the pope responded by that "as the head of the Catholic Church, [I] cannot do this." St. Pope Pius X then went on to tell Herzl that if the Jews did settle in Palestine:

> One of two things will likely happen. Either the Jews will retain their ancient faith and continue to await the Messiah whom we believe has already appeared, in which case they are denying the divinity of Jesus and we cannot assist them. Or else they will go there with no religion whatever, and then we can have nothing at all to do with them. The Jewish faith was the foundation of our own, but it has been superceded by the teachings of Christ, and we cannot admit that it still enjoys any validity. The Jews who should have been the first to acknowledge Jesus Christ have not done so to this day. . . .And so if you come to Palestine and settle your people there, we will be ready with churches and priests to baptize all of you.[21]

If the pope wanted to speak personally, he could have done so most effectively when he spoke in Bethlehem in the shadow of the 30-foot-high wall that Israel and its apologists routinely refer to as the "security fence." You know, like what Robert Frost talked about in his poem "Mending Wall," when he wrote, "Good fences make good neighbors." During his speech to the Aida refugee camp, the pope criticized the wall "towering over us" as a "tragic" barrier erected between the two communities. He used the occasion to plead the cause of the Palestinian people. "The Holy See supports the right of your people to a sovereign Palestinian homeland in the land of your forefathers, secure and at peace with its neighbours, within internationally recognized borders," the Pope said. "Although walls can easily be built," the pope said in an oblique reference to the Berlin Wall, the barrier which dominated political life in his homeland for a good portion of his life, "we all know that they do not last for ever. They can be taken down."

But surely you say, the pope can dialogue with the Jews to bring about world peace, can't he? This is pretty much what he did. After listening to Rabbi Metzger, Benedict went to the Wailing Wall and prayed for peace. He did not remove his crucifix, but the fact that it had now become *de rigueur* for popes to pray at the foundation of the obsolete structure known as the Temple

had a message all its own. On the written note which the pope inserted between "the ancient crevices of the Western Wall," the pope asked "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" to "hear the cry of the afflicted, the fearful, the bereft; send your peace upon this Holy Land, upon the Middle East, upon the entire human family."

Rabbi Metzger couldn't let Benedict's visit to the Wailing Wall pass without making invidious comparisons with his successor, to wit, "Pope John Paul II, who visited us nine years ago, placed a note between the stones of the Western Wall, and in it a request for forgiveness from the Jewish people for the suffering caused to them throughout history, and of the Christian commitment towards true fraternity between our peoples." Rabbi Metzger also had his own take on how to bring about world peace. Criticizing the mote in the Muslims' eye while ignoring the beam in his own, Metzger said "we must teach the leaders of other religions that it is not with terror that they will obtain their aims, not by the killing of innocent people do they represent their God." This from the man who blessed the killing of 1,300 Palestinians over Christmas.

ENEMIES OF LOGOS

Before leaving Israel, the pope spoke with newly elected Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who asked the pope to condemn Iran. We have no idea what the pope said in reply. We do know that Netanyahu flew on the very next day to Washington to badger President Obama into collaborating on the bombing of Iran. Israel, far from being a potential partner with whom the Vatican can work to bring about world peace, has been agitating for war—first with Iraq and now with Iran. The Israelis are, as St. Paul put it in his epistle to the Thessalonians "enemies of the whole human race."[22] As such, these enemies of Logos need special treatment. The only word that can have a salutary effect with people like this is the Divine Word, as articulated by Peter in the Acts of the Apostles. Dialogue based on any other premise is a waste of time.

Chapter Four

Close Encounters
Paul Gottfried's Friends

> "For this too is our way: to dare most liberally where we have reflected best. With others, only ignorance begets fortitude; and reflection but begets hesitation."
>
> – Pericles
>
> *Peloponnesian War*, Book II by Thucydide.

I have to admit that when I got a copy of Paul Gottfried's autobiography, *Encounters: My Life with Nixon, Marcuse, and Other Friends and Teachers*,[1] I checked the index to see if my name was mentioned. It was, of course, presumptuous of me to consider myself as having the standing of either a friend or a teacher or the stature of someone as famous as Richard Nixon or Herbert Marcuse. My only excuse for doing this is the fact that if I were writing my autobiography I would almost certainly mention him. Gottfried deals with this asymmetry in another context when, citing Aristotle, he writes, "but that is in the nature of friendship, which does not have to be a relation between those who are equally attached to each other."[2]

I met Paul Gottfried through Nino Langiulli, who was a disciple of Sidney Hook and, at the time co-editor of an anti-PC newsletter by the name of *Measure*, put out by the Center for Rational Alternatives, which was a forerunner of the anti-PC neocon operation known as the National Association of Scholars. Nino proposed Paul as the ideal reviewer for Midge Decter's memoir, and the review he wrote did nothing to disappoint our expectations. In that review, Gottfried wondered why the *goyim* were so reluctant to criticize Jews. It was one of the many things Paul said that made sense to me. Another Gottfried moment came in the living room of Tom Fleming's house in Rockford, Illinois when I described Paul Wolfowitz as exhibiting "*juedischer Groll gegen Russland*" ("Jewish animosity toward Russia," the conversation taking place in German). It was after this conversation that I decided to embark upon the research that eventually led to the publication of the first edition of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit and its Impact on World History.*

I mention this not because I think it merits mention in Paul Gottfried's autobiography. As I've already said, if anything these incidents merit mention in my autobiography, not his. I mention this because, as with *Chronicles* magazine, a journal for which both of us have written, I always seem to get in trouble, not by attacking the paleocons but by carrying their thoughts to what I consider their logical conclusion.

The best example I can give of this phenomenon is the speech I gave at the Sam Francis memorial at the National Press Club in Washington in March 2007. I have no idea why I was asked to speak at this conference. There were many people not present who knew Sam Francis better than I did, but asked to speak I was, and speak I did, and the results of my speech were such that once it was over Taki announced to everyone present his fear that we were all going to be arrested for what I said. Beginning with Peter Brimelow, one speaker after another after another marched to the podium to denounce me. Spies from the SPLC were also in the audience but refused to mention the split my words had caused. In the end, they denounced me as being "red-faced and shouting" and predictably accused me of anti-Semitism, even though I explicitly condemned anti-Semitism in my talk. And all this came from a talk in which I was trying my darndest to be irenic and build bridges between what I saw were separate factions making up the conservative movement. Just think what might have happened if I had set out to be eristic instead of irenic! As it was, my wife had to brandish her umbrella in Sam Dickson's face to keep him from storming the stage and attacking me.

And what did I say that caused such uproar? (For those of you who were not there, the speech was published as a review in the March 2007 issue of *Culture Wars*.) I did little more than unpack the implications of one Greek word, namely, logos. Paul Gottfried, who was in attendance that day at the Press Club in Washington, is certainly no stranger to Greek words. In fact, he teaches ancient Greek. He was also no stranger to the talk I gave, but knowing Greek and understanding logos are two different things.

To insure that those who had invited me knew what they were getting into, I sent the organizers an advance copy of the talk. I also sent Paul a copy and asked for his comments and suggestions. Hearing nothing from him led me to believe that he approved of what I was going to say, or at least that he didn't disapprove. I can still remember him walking toward me after I gave the speech, smiling, even if the smile was combined with a look of disbelief, and saying to me, "I can't believe you really gave that talk." Well, what did he expect me to do with it?

More perplexing (and disappointing) was his reaction a few days after the talk when he denounced just about everything I said as historically inaccurate and unduly offensive: far from being a revolutionary Jew, Caiaphas was a hidebound reactionary and supporter of Roman authority; Willi Schlamm and Frank Meyers, the men I portrayed as the Jewish revolutionaries who

undermined the conservative character of *National Review*, were in fact pro-Catholic right-wing anti-Communists who kept the errant Catholic William F. Buckley on the straight and narrow. Similarly, what I characterized as the poisonous Judaizing influence of Protestantism was, in Paul's view, a childishly oversimplified view of Reformation theology, which seems to come from European clericalist polemics. Finally, any notion that I had that a conspiracy of Jews and Protestants were responsible for the horrors of urban renewal was, in Paul's mind, "utterly laughable."

As I said, if I set out to stick my thumb in the collective eye of the paleocons, I could understand this sort of reaction. But it's bewildering when you set out to be irenic. Doubly bewildering is the fact that Paul had the speech in advance and had done nothing to save me from (in his view, at least) disgracing myself in front of the paleocon establishment, something which he could have done by pointing out the alleged historical errors upon which I had based my talk. It was as if I were walking toward an open manhole with my arms full of dishes and Paul did nothing to warn me, something which was doubly troubling because I specifically asked him to point out any errors in the talk.

Maybe I am hopelessly naïve. Maybe I am, as Tom Fleming put it in the wake of the same speech, "a holy fool" or "a child with a gun." But then again maybe something else is at work. Maybe bigger, more important issues are at stake. All of these issues would have remained in the folder of unresolved questions and then been forgotten but for the fact that Paul Gottfried decided to write his autobiography. The fact that he did helps me explicate his reaction to my speech, but more importantly it gives much needed insight into the relation between politics and the higher things upon which any political order must be based.

In the end, things are less complicated than Paul Gottfried makes them out to be. If things get complicated, it is because, as Paul should know, a small error early on becomes a very big error later on. Early on has two meanings, one according to the order of being, which is to say in the realm of metaphysics, and the other in the order of knowing, which in an autobiography means early on in life.

Paul Gottfried was born into a German-Jewish family in Bridgeport, Connecticut in 1941. He father was actually Hungarian, but Hungary at the time of his birth was part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and so, in some sense of the word, German. I remember the relief I felt while in Budapest in the 1980s, which is to say some 70 years after the collapse of the Austro-Hungarian empire, hopelessly lost, seeking in vain some sign that I could decipher in a totally alien non-Indo-European language, when an old man came up to me, accompanied by a much younger woman, and asked, "*Was suchen Sie*?" When I told him that I needed to get to the train station, he

walked to the ticket machine, bought me a ticket, and when I asked if I could pay him he responded by saying that it was "*Ein Geschenk aus Ungarn.*"

Gottfried's autobiography is suffused with the German Jew's ancestral contempt of *Ostjuden*, the Jews from the Pale of the Settlement who poured into New York from roughly 1880 until 1920 in the aftermath of their increasingly violent revolutionary activity in Russia. The German Jews who had arrived in New York generations before—the Schiffs, Warburgs, Belmonts (ne Schoenberg), and Sulzbergers, the owners of the *New York Times*, that made up "our crowd"—had (or at least revered) "*Bildung*," which is to say the appropriation of German culture that people like Moses Mendelssohn, David Friedlander and Salomon Maimon had pioneered in the days of the Enlightenment.

The *Ostjuden*, on the other hand, were characterized by "ethnic whining."[3] According to Gottfried's taxonomy, "the academic Left," like Gaul, can be divided into three parts, the first two parts being Jewish. Type One is made up of good Jews, i.e., German Jews like Paul Gottfried, "representatives of which were predominantly Central European in ancestry, were conspicuously bookish and spent considerable energy working to make the world conform to a Marxist scheme of reality." Then there was the second type, the bad Jews, which is to say, "New York Jews of Eastern European origin who were fixated on one overriding fear: anti-Semitism"[4]: "They were and are the most insecure group I have ever known, and their prominence in today's elite history departments testifies to the decrepitude of an older Christian establishment they easily replaced." If anything the WASP *goyim*, which is to say Type Three academics, were even more contemptible than the *Ostjuden* members of Type Two because

> Whenever Type Two members are moved to scream "fascist," "racist," and "anti-Semitic," droves of non-Jewish academics can be expected to rush to their defense and call for therapeutic and political action.

Hate, as we know from reading *First Things*, is a Jewish virtue. When it comes to his dealings with Norman Podhoretz, Midge Decter, Gertrude Himmelfarb and the the *Ostjuden* who make up the neocon establishment, Paul Gottfried is typically Jewish. Not even the patina of time can dull his animus against the *Ostjuden* who ruined his career by blocking his attempt to get an academic position at CUA and a political position as head of the NEH.

Hate may be a Jewish virtue, but for those who aspire to docility to *logos*, it has its drawbacks because, like appetite, it distorts reality. One drawback is lack of coherence in a memoir that seeks to create unity out of a series of "encounters." If you expected some coherent explanation of how religion, ethnicity, politics, political movements and academe fit together in one orderly scheme, this is not your book. What we have instead is a virtual stew of memories containing all of the above ingredients simmering away in a

sauce flavored by ambition, an herb that has left a particularly bitter taste in Paul Gottfried's mouth.

Paul treats us to an entire chapter on Herbert Marcuse, the man who joined Freud and Marx at the hip, creating thereby the New Left of the '60s, a political movement which Gottfried, as a man of the right, should presumably hate. From the political perspective of a man who voted for Richard Nixon in 1968, Marcuse should have been the villain of the story, but this is not the case, because ethnicity trumps politics in this instance. Marcuse was sympathetic because, unlike the boorish *Ostjuden* at *Commentary*, "he oozed traditional German *Bildung*."[5] At another point Gottfried tells us that "Marcuse's . . . background reminded me of my father's family, German speaking Jews who had fled from the Nazis and spoke English with a similar inflection."[6]

Gottfried comes across as sympathetic in passages like this because of unabashedly frank support of filial piety and ethnic solidarity. These are virtues that any paleocon must honor, but they are not ultimate virtues by any stretch of the imagination, especially in a man who aspires to the intellectual life. For someone who feels that the unexamined life is not worth living, something else is needed, some understanding of where these virtues fit into the hierarchy of things as they are. The Greek term for this conjunction of being and reason is *logos*. The pale English equivalent is "reason." The Latin word is *ratio*, but the thing itself transcends all languages. What is *logos*? According to Josef Pieper's account in *The Four Cardinal Virtues*.[7]

> "Reason" means. . . nothing other than "regard for and openness to reality," and "acceptance of reality." And "truth" is to him [St. Thomas Aquinas] nothing other than the unveiling and revelation of reality, of both natural and supernatural reality.

Filial piety is good, even if you grow up in a family of criminals, because you owe your parents a debt for bringing you into existence. But filial piety should not be confused with moral theology, as it would be if the son of a *mafioso* were to claim that loan-sharking is a good thing because his father did it.

Unlike the neocon apologists for empire, who believe that America is a propositional nation which obliterates both the past and ethnicity of any individual who moves here, Gottfried understands the perduring nature of ethnicity in American life. When he brought up the (to him) "self-evident truth that much of the radical project of the Frankfurt School was attributable to the Jewishness of its founders,"[8] he was "scolded" for "recycling a position that is intrinsically anti-Semitic."

When it comes to the influence of ethnicity on American life, Gottfried is much closer to the Hungarian Catholic émigré John Lukacs, who felt that "ethnic hostilities often seethe behind the exterior of human-rights language and the rhetoric of inclusiveness." The eclipse of the WASP elite did nothing to change this. In fact,

> The fading of the old guard from prominence and leadership, together with its waning self-respect, has accelerated the venting of hostilities by more demonstrative ethnics who nurse grievances against the old patriciate and against each other.[9]

In pointing out the persistence of ethnic antagonism in American life, Gottfried was viewed by colleagues and students alike as somehow "un-American," a favorite term of abuse that has been succeeded by "anti-Semitic" as the best way to end an argument.

Ethnic solidarity is good, even if you're a gypsy, but it is not an ultimate good, and to understand the quality of its goodness, the man who aspires to be a philosopher must be able to integrate this good into its proper place in an objective hierarchy of goods. In order to accomplish this integration, a gypsy who aspired to be a philosopher would have to be able to make distinctions. So ethnic solidarity is good, but theft, which is part of gypsy culture, is bad. *Logos* in this instance means both facing up to reality and having the fortitude to say something that might be considered politically incorrect—e.g., the Frankfurt School was Jewish or theft is part of gypsy culture—and then integrating that insight into an objective hierarchy of being.

Paul Gottfried has trouble in both areas, i.e., with regard to both prudence and fortitude. Early on in his autobiography, Gottfried tells us that he had been warned by his parents, "Don't go into anything that requires you to grovel to get ahead."[10] The fact that he then went into academe is not a sign of filial piety. One reason Gottfried enjoyed Marcuse's class was because "this graying German radical thrived on debate."[11] In his other classes at Yale, however, Gottfried "felt forced to cut off my remarks lest I injure my professional future by expressing unreasonable views (something that I ultimately did)." It's difficult to see exactly what Paul means. Since the highest good for man is reason, "expressing unreasonable views" is a bad thing, and expressing them would expose a defect of the intellect. One gets the impression though that what Paul means by "unreasonable views" is, in effect views which are true but unpopular. Suppressing that sort of thing would indicate moral defect.

Similarly, when it comes to other ethnic groups Gottfried has difficulty making certain basic distinctions. He has difficulty, for example distinguishing between Catholics, who are all sinners, and the Church, which is perfect, or, put another way, between the opinions of Catholics and Catholic principle. Ethnicity in America is based on religion, but, even admitting that, logos impels us to distinguish between the ethnic group and the religion which informs it. The same distinction is true of individuals in that group, who, in the case of Catholicism, tend to ignore whichever precepts the dominant culture finds repugnant.

The same thing is *a fortiori* true of Jews because Jews, unlike gypsies, are a very important ethnic group. In fact, Jews make up an ethnic group unlike

any other because of their former identity as God's chosen people. Beginning with the crucifixion, Jewish identity has been based on the Talmud, which is based on rejection of *logos* in all of its forms from rejection of Jesus Christ, the Word made flesh, to rejection of the moral law and cardinal virtues like justice when it comes to business dealings with the *goyim*. Heinrich Graetz, a German Jew who was a towering manifestation of the *Bildung* which Paul Gottfried admires, explained in great detail in his *magnum opus* how study of the Talmud had led to the moral corruption of the *Ostjuden* who were the progenitors of the staff at *Commentary* and the *Weekly Standard*. Talmudic scholarship was, in other words, a contradiction in terms. It was an exercise in anti-Logos. It was human reason at war with itself.

Gottfried never says this explicitly, but we get the impression that his undergraduate days at Yeshiva University left him vaguely dissatisfied with being a Jew, in spite of all the ethnic solidarity the experience provided. "I felt," Gottfried tells us,

> a massive cultural barrier separating me from my new classmates, who were preponderantly from Brooklyn and Queens, had attended one of several Orthodox Jewish schools and seemed to carry with them the social gracelessness of having grown up in a transported Eastern European Ghetto. . . . My religious beliefs seemed less and less to resemble those of my classmates, a fact that I noticed during my college years. I have never really been an Orthodox Jew, even if I had been a conventionally observant one. At the same time, I did keep traditional Jewish and other Rabbinic laws, although never with the rigor displayed by my Orthodox associates. These laws were for me mainly an ethnic and cultural point of reference. I could not relate them to a well-developed theology, as an ad hoc justification for ordering one's communal life in accordance with certain Rabbinic teachings.[12]

Paul Gottfried made contact with logos while in college, but only in a negative sense when he discovered that the Talmud could not lead to a "well-developed theology." But instead of embarking upon a path that could, Gottfried turned to German *Bildung* for the answer to questions about higher things. Gottfried refers to Spinoza as an early role model because he was "the first evolutionary thinker" and claims that

> By the time I was in my third year of college, I had come close to accepting, without knowing it, Spinoza's scheme of human spiritual progress, from the Mosaic code through the visions of universalist prophets, like Isaiah, to the teachings of Jesus.[13]

But it's clear that the evolutionary thinker who really informs Gottfried's thought is G. W. F. Hegel. From his work on Hegel and the post-War American Right, Gottfried learned "that historical consciousness defines a truly conservative worldview."[14]

From a theological perspective, Gottfried has had a "lifelong affinity for Calvinism," but in spite of that:

> I could never quite bring myself to become a Protestant, although I resonated to what the Reformers had said about the dialectic between faith and the law. God for me was the Hebrew one, who existed in splendid, transcendent Otherness. It was inconceivable for me that He would have condescended to have himself tortured to death in order to atone for "our sins."[15]

Gottfried's sarcastic use of quotes is telling. Even the judaizing revolutionary movement known as Calvinism had too much logos in it for Paul's taste because, even if they tried to supplant the New Testament with the Old as their guide for life, Calvinists still believed that Christ died on the Cross for "our sins."

Bildung may have liberated Jews like Mendelssohn and Maimon from the tyranny of the Talmud but in doing so it became a more sophisticated form of intellectual bondage. The same was true of Paul Gottfried. Instead of attaining the bread of logos, Gottfried settled for a stone, namely, the truncated form of logos known as the Enlightenment. Or as he put it, Gottfried saw in Spinoza, someone who espoused, "A historical stage on the way of a fuller religious consciousness—rather than a permanent counsel for dealing with those whose ethical and spiritual lives seem defective."

Appalled by the intellectual chaos of the Talmud that derived from the Jews' rejection of *logos*, Paul Gottfried became a Hegelian, which involved him in a more sophisticated rejection of *logos*. By substituting history for the principle of non-contradiction, the Hegelian is forced to bend his knee in worship of the *Zeitgeist*, and condemned to learn that he who lives by the dialectical sword will also die by it. The great irony of Gottfried's book is that the encounters that make up his career tell the sad story of a Hegelian who ended up on the wrong side of history by backing an obsolete revolutionary movement.

From a political perspective, paleoconservatives like Gottfried did us all a service in the late '80s and early '90s by warning us of the dangers the neocons posed for America, warnings that were borne out when the neocons hijacked American foreign policy during the Bush Administration and involved America in a disastrous war with Iraq. Gottfried was ahead of his time when he writes:

> By the late '70s I noticed with growing discomfort the unalterably leftist sensibilities of many neoconservative journalists and social scientists. . . . Such characteristic views of theirs as attachment ot the anti-Soviet Left, a fixation on Christian anti-Semitism, and a raging hatred of Germans, Russians, and white Southerners, it dawned on me that I was looking at

> a mere variation on those usual opinions that could be found in the *New York Review of Books* and the *New Republic*.[16]

Then mysteriously the paleocon movement switched horses in mid-stream and started beating the drum against "Islamofascism" in a way that rendered it indistinguishable from *Commentary* or the *Weekly Standard*. I remember attending a *Chronicles* conference and listening to a talk by Srdja Trifkovich on the threat which Islam posed to the West. In the question and answer period following the talk I said, "I can understand your feelings toward Islam. If I were a Serb, I would feel the same way. But America has never been threatened by Islam, and the only reason we are threatened now is because of our support of Israel."

Afterward Trifkovich admitted what I said was true, but he then added, "You can't say that sort of thing in public."

Paul Gottfried is not Srdja Trifkovich, but the two men were associated with the same political movement and it is that movement, as explicated by Gottfried's autobiography, that we are trying to explain here. If life were a Venn diagram, there would be considerable overlap between these two circles. In the glossy photo section in the middle of *Encounters*, Paul chose a photograph of what might be described as the paleocon politburo as of 1987. He is pictured to the left standing next to Sam Francis. Tom Fleming is off to the right, standing between Joe Sobran and Murray Rothbard. Lew Rockwell is there too, along with Mel Bradford and Alan Carlson. Paul's autobiography is not a history of the paleoconservative movement, but it does elucidate what went wrong with the movement. It also shows the limits of any political movement which refuses to take account of both being (as in my statement to Trifkovich) and fortitude (or the lack thereof, as in his inability to state publicly what he knew to be true).

Let's leave *fortitudo* aside for a moment, since it is ancillary to *prudentia*, and let's instead concentrate on the cognitive nature of prudence. "In colloquial use," Pieper tells us,

> prudence always carries the connotation of timorous, small-minded self-preservation, of a rather selfish concern about oneself. Neither of these traits is compatible with nobility; both are unworthy of the noble man. . . . The common mind regards prudence and fortitude as virtually contradictory ideas. A "prudent" man is thought to be one who avoids the embarrassing situation of having to be brave. The "prudent" man is the "clever tactician" who contrives to escape personal commitment. . . . Those who shun danger are wont to account for their attitude by appealing to the necessity for "prudence." . . . Modern man . . . will often call lies and cowardice prudent, truthfulness and courageous sacrifice imprudent.[17]

So much for contemporary distortions of the term. In reality, prudence is "the model and mother of all virtues, the circumspect and resolute shaping power of our minds which transforms knowledge of reality into realization of the good."[18] Prudence involves "the brave boldness to make final decisions. It means purity, straightforwardness, candor and simplicity of character; it means standing superior to the utilitarian complexities of mere 'tactics.'"

Real prudence means making the right decision, but in order to make the right decision a man must first know the truth of the situation. In other words, to make the right decision ultimately, a man must first be docile to being. He must possess "the ability to be still in order to attain objective perception of reality." This leads us to the true definition of the virtue of prudence, namely, "that the objective cognition of reality shall determine action; that the truth of real things shall become determinative."[19]

This is no simple matter, but Gottfried makes the issue more complicated than it is by claiming that political life is full of random options. Instead of responding to the reality of political life in America in the late 20th century, which is to say the Jewish takeover of first American culture, then the conservative movement, and finally, during the Bush Administration, America's foreign policy, the paleoconservative movement in a moment of false prudence decided to suppress the truth of what it knew.

Gottfried gives the impression not only that he can choose his battles, which is true, but also that he can choose, in the manner of a German idealist, whether or not a war is going on, which he cannot. When Gottfried describes his politics what comes across is philosophical consumerism, with Paul picking and choosing at the intellectual salad bar. Paul can mix and match his political options *ad libidem*:

> One could conceivably sympathize with the Southern side in the US Civil War, lean toward he Central Powers in the First World War, or believe that Martin Luther King was not a secular saint but a Marxist demagogue, and still be passionately supportive of Israel, as I explained in a feature essay on the changing foreign policy of the American right in *Orbis* (Winter 2007). Not every part of the neoconservative bundle of sentiments is related to every other one; nor does it receive its motive power exclusively from the impulse to rally to the Israeli government against its critics.[20]

The issue is simpler than that. The armature of history revolves around *logos* and man's rejection of it, otherwise known as revolution. The Catholic Church is on the side of *logos*; Jews are by nature revolutionaries. Each historical epoch involves a struggle between the forces of *logos* and its revolutionary opponents. Over the course of the last 2000 years since the Logos became Incarnate, the Church has been the force which has stood for *logos*, and the Jews have

allied themselves with every revolutionary assault on that order, oftentimes by becoming the revolutionary avant garde, to use Marx's term.

Gottfried's autobiography is silent on the big picture, no matter how you define that term. Gottfried is even more conflicted when it comes to the Catholic Church than he is in dealing with the Jews. As I have already indicated, he is unable to distinguish between Catholics, who are all sinners, and the Church, which is perfect. As a result, he invariably makes judgments about the Catholic Church and its teachings based on the Catholics he knew in Connecticut growing up or, worse still, Catholics he may have had in his classes at places like Elizabethtown College. The net result is an ethnic animus even stronger than the grudge which Gottfried holds against the neocons.

But beyond that, Gottfried is unable to discern which groups support *logos* (or revolution) and which groups oppose it. Without this ability, there is no possible way to formulate anything approaching a coherent philosophy of "conservatism." Gottfried's biography is full of conversion stories, during the course of which an ideologue, usually a Marxist, someone like Eugene Genovese, awakes to *logos* and in some instances converts to the Catholic Faith, as Genovese's wife, Elizabeth Fox Genovese, did. Christopher Lasch seems to have made a similar contact with logos toward the end of his life, yet Gottfried dismisses his book *The True and Only Heaven* out of what sounds suspiciously like ethnic prejudice:

> The good types [*in The True and Only Heaven*] who redeemed his [Lasch's] dualistic universe were often the progenitors of the Catholic blue-collar working families that I can still vaguely recall from the 1950s. These families were marked by multiple offspring and by wives who prepared their husbands' lunch pails. Lasch's evocation of the females in his ideal but perhaps archaic nuclear family caused the feminist Susan Faludi to designate him as the "leading American sexist of the'90s."[21]

Is it possible that Professor Gottfried believes that there are various kinds of family and that some varieties could be called "ideal but archaic"? If so, how does this essentially Foucaultian view correspond to conservatism?

Paul sought to avoid this dichotomy (and every other dichotomy based on the principle of non-contradiction) by becoming a Hegelian, but, by becoming a Hegelian, Gottfried condemned himself to worship the *Zeitgeist*, which is to say, whoever happened to be the Napoleon, the man Hegel worshipped as the *Zeitgeist* on horseback, of his age. From an ethnic, political and philosophical perspective Paul should have joined forces with the Neocons and marched with them in triumph as they took over Washington in the 1980s.

From a Jewish point of view, however, Gottfried found the prospect of working with *Ostjuden*, a group he considered a bunch of loathsome parvenus, personally repugnant. As a result he found himself impelled by a concatenation of forces—ethnic, personal, etc.—into taking a default

position by backing not a counter-revolutionary movement which could be justly termed "conservative," but an obsolete revolutionary movement instead. His choice of role models is instructive: "Some educated, wealthy German Jews turned toward the cultural and aesthetic Right, as exemplified by the rarefied circled centered around the poet-seer Stefan George."

In other words, it was the "cunning of reason," to appropriate Hegel's term, and not *logos* which formed Paul, and turned him into a right-wing, Jewish Hegelian, which in this day and age is something akin to being the world's tallest midget. Needless to say, the most famous right-wing Hegelian of the 20th century was Adolf Hitler. Chesterton, as Robert Hickson pointed out in an article in *Culture Wars*, saw the affinities between Nazism and Judaism, and so it should not be surprising that Jews should see them too and be drawn to the same philosophy that Hitler found attractive. What's puzzling is how anyone could think that an American political movement could be based on it. But that is what Gottfried tried to do.

More surprising still is that he chose this quixotic path in the name of political realism. Gottfried was always ready to disparage his comrades-in-arms as "beautiful losers," a term he appropriated from Sam Francis and which he applied to people like Russell Kirk, Pat Buchanan, and Sam Francis himself whenever Gottfried felt they violated political taboos. One of the most egregious examples, in Gottfried's mind, took place when Russell Kirk "delivered a scathing and unexpected indictment of the neoconservatives at the Heritage Foundation in 1988." Gottfried says, "I sat in the audience with an open mouth, more surprised than delighted by what seemed in this particular context a possibly costly indiscretion. (The speaker was being paid by a then largely neoconservative foundation for his rhetorical services.)"[22]

Kirk's "indiscretion" involved saying that the capital of the United States was Washington not Tel Aviv. If conservatives had heeded what Kirk said and if they had stood up to the *Ostjuden* in 1988, then perhaps the country might have been spared the disaster of the Bush Administration and his disastrous Iraqi war. That they did not is not Russell Kirk's fault. Kirk should be praised for his courage in stating an inconvenient truth. Instead he is damned with faint praise by a man who headed to the tall grass (as Pat Buchanan would have put it) with the rest of the intellectual cowards that made up the conservative establishment at the time.

What exactly is the problem here? Was Kirk wrong? Did Gottfried feel that the *Ostjuden* were a benign influence on our foreign policy? No, what Russell Kirk said corresponded to being, and in saying what he said, Kirk was being docile to the truth, the cognitive prerequisite for prudence. The fault lay not with Kirk but with the "prudence of the flesh" exhibited by the conservative establishment, which chose to punish the messenger that brought the bad news. Paul Gottfried, the Hegelian who worships history as the repudiation

of logos, concurs in their act of intellectual cowardice by claiming that telling the truth in this instance was a "costly indiscretion."

This is not the only instance of Gottfried disguising his timidity as prudence. Paul faults Pat Buchanan for defending John Demjanjuk, a man the Israeli Supreme Court eventually exonerated of the charges brought against him. "Discretion," Gottfried tells us, "was urgently needed, particularly since Pat may have been planning to run for president at the time that he was rallying to Demjanjuk's defense." Predictably, Gottfried criticizes Buchanan for telling the truth and ascribes that "flaw" to "Pat's tendency to move from boldness into rashness, a quality of character that is one of Aristotle's vices."

Sam Francis gets the same treatment. According to Gottfried's analysis, Francis "was ousted from the staff of the *Washington Times* for his accumulated indiscretions":[23]

> The straw that broke the camel's back was a speech Sam delivered at a 1994 conference held by *American Renaissance*, a publication that has been properly described as "soft racialist."

Gottfried admired Sam Francis: "Although my junior by five years, he was the contemporary on the American Right who shaped my thinking most decisively." Gottfried claims that Sam, like Will Herberg, whom Gottfried also admired, "thirsted for righteousness." What made these figures "beautiful losers," in Gottfried's eyes, was "their willingness to forego worldly success for what they believed." But underneath the encomia, there is the subtle insinuation that Sam lacked "prudence," by which Paul means "*prudentia carnalis*," the prudence of the flesh:

> If my friend hoped to survive as a journalist in the present society, he would have to stay away from "insensitive" subjects. The alternative . . . was to do something that did not require direct contact with the media, the priests of the PC religion. In the world of communications, doctrinal conformity would likely remain the established rule.

Gottfried goes on to defend Francis by claiming that the neocon Douglas Feith was even more of a "soft racialist" than Sam, when what he should have done is correct Sam for his "racialism." From the point of view of prudence, Sam was the opposite of Srdja Trifkovich. His "soft racialist" views, as Paul puts it, were a sign of defective intellect, not suppression of the truth. He was ignorant, but not wicked. Instead of chiding him for his "indiscretion," Paul should have enlightened him about the intellectual inadequacy of the racial view of life. Sam had fortitude even if he lacked a proper understanding of reality, but fortitude cannot exist without prudence. What we have instead is bellicosity or rashness which urges the man without prudence to charge the machine gun nest of revolution waving the spear of his own anger.

Paul's choice of words is telling. He accuses his comrades-in-arms of "indiscretion" whenever they tell an inconvenient truth. Discretion is a purely

subjective term. It refers to "the power or right to decide according to one's own judgment, freedom of judgment or choice." Prudence, on the other hand, is a cardinal virtue. Indeed, it is the prime cardinal virtue, and it is missing from Paul's lexicon.

This is not simply a semantic issue. Prudence is one of the pillars of *logos*, and prudence is based on "an objective cognition of reality." There are two impediments to achieving an "objective cognition of reality." The first is defect of intellect. The second is defect of character. "We are astonished," Pieper tells us, "and yet to some extent we understand, when Thomas Aquinas discovers that these imprudences of 'omission' have their origin in unchastity, in that surrender to the goods of the sensual world which splits the power of decision in two." Deliberation is part of prudence, but it kicks in only after recognizing "the duties enforced on us by things as they are."[24]

What Srdja Trifkovich exhibited in his private conversation with me was not ignorance; it was wickedness. It was a willful suppression of the truth, which is the prerequisite of prudence, and therefore the prerequisite of all of the other cardinal virtues. As Pieper puts it, "Whoever rejects truth, whether natural or supernatural, is really 'wicked' and beyond conversion." Like the mainstream conservatism from which it derived, paleoconservatism aborted itself in the name of what Pieper would call

> "prudence of the flesh," which, "instead of serving the true end of all of human life. . . is directed solely toward the goods of the body and is, according to the Epistle to the Romans, "death" and "the enemy of God."

Prudence means that

> not only the end of human action but also the means for its realization shall be in keeping with the truth of real things. This in turn necessitates that the egocentric "interests" of man be silenced in order that he may perceive the truth of real things, and so that reality itself may guide him to the proper means for realizing his goal.

An age which glorifies technique unsurprisingly mistakenly assumes that what the ancients called prudence is in reality cunning (or *astutia*), and as a result the political movements which those who claim to be wise in the ways of the world create and manage invariably succumb to the dangers associated with false prudence. This is most apparent in the chapters in *Encounters* about Gottfried's academic career and his failed attempt to become chairman of the NEH. Gottfried spends a good deal of his autobiography talking about his academic career. Having gone to Yale for graduate school, Gottfried had certain expectations about academic life. By the time wrote his autobiography those expectation had turned to ashes.

> Although I courted well-placed academics and enjoyed the smells and sounds of famous universities in my younger years, as I have grown older

> I have developed a distaste for academic culture. Most precisely, I have developed a Nietzschean reaction to the girly men and virago women that populate university settings.

As a result of these disappointments, Gottfried decided in his early fifties "that I would no longer seek academic advancement." Instead, he contented himself with his tenured position "at Elizabethtown College, which as far as I could tell was the only college that would have me."[25]

Just why Gottfried should feel so sad about his academic career is not clear. He does, after all, have an endowed chair, which is more than Sam Francis ended up with. It may not be at what Gottfried considers a prestigious institution, but Chestnut Hill College, where John Lukacs, a man whom Gottfried admires, taught for years is hardly prestigious either.

Perhaps Gottfried is sad because he is a teacher who doesn't like teaching. He certainly doesn't like his students, whom he dismisses as yahoos every time they come up in the book. The antipathy seems to be mutual. After listening to their "gibberish" in response to a question about Senator McCarthy in his class, Gottfried concludes his description by writing, "Once it was over, they went back to jabbering on their cell phones and supplying each other with information about which designer's jeans were on sale at the local mall."

The sadness Gottfried manifests is not uncommon among professors these days but it has less to do with the quality of student and more to do with thwarted ambition and the *acedia* which flows from it. *Acedia*, according to Pieper, "is the dreary sadness of heart unwilling to accept the greatness to which man is called by God." One reason for Gottfried's *acedia* may be the fact that Gottfried has followed the advice he has given to others, and things have not worked out as he expected. In his quest to become head of the National Endowment for the Humanities, Gottfried listened as his advisors "stressed the need for me to keep a low profile and not to grant compromising interviews if I made it onto the short list. Above all I should not appear to be on the far right." ("Buckley," Genovese told Gottfried, "has worked out a *modus vivendi* with the Neos—to speak bluntly, the NY Jews . . .") That being the case, Genovese counseled Gottfried: "For God's sake, keep your mouth shut. Bradford was ruined by being sucked into an interview with the *Washington Post*."[26]

All of this "*astutia*," however, led to nothing but the taste of ashes in Gottfried's mouth. In fact, Gottfried's description of his academic battles points out the futility of acting according to the "prudence of the flesh," better than anything Aquinas could say.

The turning point in Gottfried's career came when he tried to get an appointment as Genovese's "vassal" (his term) in the University of Rochester history department, a plan thwarted by his ally later in life, Christopher Lasch:

> The setback that I suffered was so devastating that my career never really recovered. Not even the scheming that caused me to lose a graduate professorship at CUA 17 yeas later did as much harm to me as Lasch caused in a single afternoon of conversation. . . . It was a prestigious department, membership in which would have opened other professional doors, and at 29 I would have been young enough to take full advantage of my appointment. Within a year [1970] the job market would collapse.

And yet, in spite of the bitterness he felt at the time, Gottfried feels that Lasch may have had a point in opposing his nomination because

> He had been genuinely concerned about what he saw as the highhanded way in which Gene was dealing with his duties as chairman, and he feared that Gene was trying to fill the junior professorships in the department with hand picked vassals.

And furthermore:

> It was entirely possible that out of gratitude and youthful enthusiasm I would have been what my Stalinist chairman Gene was looking for: an indisputable academic conservative who could be counted on to rally to his benefactor.

Gottfried's description of his academic career is, in many ways, the most depressing part of a depressing book because in this section Gottfried comes across as an "intriguer who has regard for only 'tactics,'" who "can neither face things squarely nor act straightforwardly."[27] In describing what he considers his failed career, Gottfried becomes a paradigmatic example of "the folly of cunning," according to which "the loquacious and therefore unhearing bias of the 'tactician' . . . obstructs the path of realization, blocks it off from the truth of real things."

Henry Kissinger once said that academic politics is so vicious because the stakes are so low. If there is anything more depressing that an account of academic politics, it is an account of the "Insidiousness, guile, craft and concupiscence" that "are the refuge of small-minded and small-souled persons" who engage in losing academic battles. Pieper says that "All these false prudences and superprudences arise from covetousness," which "means . . . immoderate straining for all the possessions which man thinks are needed to assure his own importance and status (*altitudo, sublimitas*). Covetousness means an anxious senility, desperate self-preservation, overriding concern for confirmation and security."

There is no point in second-guessing the outcome of long-lost academic battles. The point which comes across—subliminally, at least—in *Encounters* is that the disgust which Gottfried feels toward the girly men and manly viragos of academe is self-disgust, not so much as at having fought and lost, but at having to descend to the level of his opponents and still lose. There was

no magnanimity in these battles because as Thomas declares in the *Summa Theologica* and Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, magnanimity disdains intrigue and "prefers in all things to act openly."

Over the course of Gottfried's career, conservatism became more and more cut off from reality, largely because of the timidity of its proponents. Gottfried refers to Sam Francis as a "beautiful loser" largely because Francis believed that Middle American Radicals would rise up and throw the managerial elites out of office:

> Our political and to some extent social life was dominated by a managerial class pushing an egalitarian ideology; and that the only way in which the Right, however one defined it, could offer effective opposition to managerial tyranny was through a mass movement. That movement was to be based, Sam argued . . . on the propagation of a "redemptive myth."

The problem, according to Gottfried, is that:

> Sam never made entirely clear how this invented "myth" would work to achieve his end. The primitive Christian church, in which Sorel had located the power of a successful myth, truly believed its message. . . Early Christians went to their deaths bearing witness to God's promise of redemption. But such would not be true for the kind of mass leader whom Sam had in mind. Such a figure wold be intrinsically different from those fearless leaders of the early church and of the anarchist movement (both of which Sorel cited to illustrate his thesis). What was not supposedly needed was a social redeemer who would devise an end-of-days scenario for political purposes. With some luck, Sam's temporal savior would turn the average yuppie family into a raging opponent of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.[28]

In spite of Gottfried's affection for Sam Francis, his description of Sam's vision of "Middle American Radicals," based on the research of Michigan scholar Donald Warren, is suffused with condescension. Who could seriously believe that a "Middle American revolt" would surge out of the "heartland"?[29] Condescension turns to something akin to sneering when Gottfried adds, "Whether this heartland referred to a place of the heart, a geographic region, or a sociological category was never fully explained."

Gottfried devotes a whole chapter of *Encounters* to Richard Nixon. The chapter on Nixon is the main "encounter" in the book, but even doing this Gottfried fails to see Nixon's real achievement and instead judges him according to the litmus tests of movement conservatism. This a significant omission because Nixon succeeded in realizing Sam Francis's fantasy of a "Middle American revolt" surging out of the heartland. Nixon didn't just talk about a "Middle American revolt"; he actually succeeded in mobilizing the middle American radicals he called the silent majority by taking control of the most powerful political office in the land. Instead of conferring with

the gurus of movement conservatism, Nixon did this by maintaining contact with "reality." Nixon, whatever his faults, possessed the virtue of prudence. He understood who his allies and who his enemies were and did not make the mistake of trying to make an idol out of clay and iron by mixing natural allies and enemies in the same political movement. Nixon was the political genius who pried Catholic ethnics away from the Democratic Party for the first time since the New Deal. He was also reality-based enough to know that the Jews were his enemies because of the counter-revolution he was engaged in. Richard Nixon was prudent in the Thomistic sense of the term. His politics were reality-based and not ideological, and yet for all his praise of Nixon and his description of their dinners together, Gottfried seems blind to his achievement.

Ronald Reagan built on Nixon's achievement, but he also destroyed it by bringing the *Ostjuden* Gottfried detests to Washington. Midge Decter mentions this moment in her memoirs:

> As a kind of foretelling of Reagan's Washington, one day in the late '70s my husband and I answered an invitation to come to [the] Heritage [Foundation] and lecture. . . . Not long after that, out of the blue, as it were, Ed Feulner, the president of Heritage, invited me to lunch. To my astonishment he asked me if I would be willing to serve on his board of trustees, and perhaps somewhat to his astonishment I took no more than three seconds to say yes.[30]

Decter then wondered why she had been tapped for the post: "Was I perhaps there as a Jew?"

What Nixon knew, but which Ronald Reagan did not, is as Father Hesburgh put it, "If you let the Jews in they take over." This is precisely what happened to the Republican Party during the presidency of George W. Bush. The Jews, as masters of discourse, first redefined conservatism to mean, above all else, support of Israel, then the neocons dragged the United States into a disastrous war in Iraq, as Gottfried's friend Steve Sniegoski has demonstrated in his book *The Transparent Cabal*. And in doing that the Jews wrecked the Republican Party, a political institution that was a significant vehicle of counter-revolution under Richard Nixon.

The demise of the Republican Party at the hands of the Jews who first hijacked it and then abandoned it should be a cautionary tale for any reality-based conservative. One lesson to be derived from this tale is that anyone who constructs an intellectual edifice in defiance of *logos*, as both Jews and Hegelians do in their separate ways, will not know how to act properly, because without prudence there is no proper action. Needless to say, those who build political movements upon a foundation which takes no cognizance of prudence are doomed to failure. This is so because

> . . . prudence is the standard of volition and action; but the standard of prudence, on the other hand, is the *ipsa res*, the "thing itself," the objective reality of being. And therefore, the pre-eminence of prudence signifies first of all the direction of volition and action toward truth; but finally it signifies the directing of volition and action toward objective reality. The good is prudent beforehand, but that is prudent which is in keeping with reality.

If action toward truth is the basis of prudence and hence of any successful action, and hence of any successful political action, then conservatism was doomed from the start because it was created to suppress the truth in the interest of political expedience. If we take ISI, the publisher of Gottfried's memoir as some indication of a conservative foundation, its point was to confound *logos* by getting Catholics, as in the students who went to Villanova and Fordham, to act like Jews, people like Frank Meyer and the other Jews who did the intellectual heavy lifting at *National Review*. Conservatism was a crypto-Jewish ideology. The *National Review* crowd had nothing but contempt for Richard Nixon because of his lack of ideological purity. Frank Meyer, in fact, took the occasion of Richard Nixon's presidential nomination to lecture a group of (most probably Catholic) student activists on the difference between real and false conservatism. Real conservatism was Jewish, or as Murray Friedman put it:

> Meyer declared, in a manner Jewish neoconservatives would adopt later, "a revolutionary force" that shattered "the unity and balance of civilization." Conservatism should not be limited to an uncomplicated reverence for the past, which is the essence of natural conservatism. The conscious conservative, he proclaimed, was required to become, in a nonpejorative sense, an ideologue, with a clear understanding of how principles and institutions and men affect each other to form a culture and a society.[31]

When Richard Nixon mobilized the Catholic ethnics in 1968 and 1972, the Catholics did not have to convert to another religion, the religion of conservatism, to be saved. That's why people like Frank Meyer hated Richard Nixon. That's also why the movement failed in a way that Nixon's presidency—aborted though it may have been—did not.

In the end conservatism had no fortitude because it had no prudence because "only the prudent man can be brave." The movement was full of men who tried to cling "to the delusion that the disharmony of the world is fundamentally curable by cautious and correct 'tactics.'"[32] The movement had brave men who were misguided and intelligent men who lacked courage, but what it lacked was the kind of man who

> walks straight up to the cause of his fear and is not deterred from doing that which is good; if, moreover, he does so for the sake of good—which

> ultimately means for the sake of God, and therefore not from ambition or from fear of being taken for a coward—this man, and he alone, is truly brave.[33]

The net result of Gottfried's "prudence of the flesh" is pessimism. Self-control is obsolete. The lesson Gottfried derives from Plato is that "most people never subdue their appetites and passions in order to rule over themselves, let alone others, by applying '*logistikon* [reasoning power].'" Worse still,

> since public administration and the media now direct our lives and opinions, Plato's teaching about self-control may have become politically irrelevant. No longer is there any need for prudential reason as a check on the intemperate elements of our nature. People have outsourced this task through their certified votes to social professionals.[34]

The political movement he shared with the men in that room at the Rockford Institute, in other words, "The American future as envisaged by our companions" turns out to be, upon closer inspection, "an exercise in wishful thinking." The West could be saved through "a successful reappropriation by Christianity of its own redemptive history," but since Gottfried doesn't believe in that redemptive history, why should anyone else believe it?[35]

The related issues of "redemptive myth" and "redemptive history" bring up the most glaring omission in Gottfried's book, namely, Sam Francis's deathbed conversion to the "redemptive myth" of Catholicism. Gottfried admired Sam Francis:

> Whatever my personal setbacks, I resent what happened to him more than I do my own tribulations. While I managed to survive my enemies this was not true for my reclusive friend, who expressed unseasonable thoughts all too loudly.[36]

But, as in other instances, Gottfried felt the need to suppress the truth, in this instance, the most significant act of Sam's life, his final turning to logos at the end. As Pieper points out, in this age, i.e., *anno domini*, the year of Our Lord, there is no such thing as *logos* without Christ. That is why the account of Sam's deathbed conversion, which was probably the most controversial part of my talk, is such a significant omission. Paul mentions the funeral at Lookout Mountain. He mentions the ministrations of Sylvia Crutchfield (but not that she stood guard at Sam's hospital door to keep Father Scalia from administering the last rites, an action thwarted by God's power). But he does not mention that Sam, in spite of his cyncism, his disappointments, his wrong-headed racism, and his *acedia*, still chose *logos* in the end by choosing to die as a Catholic. Gottfried's failure to mention Sam's deathbed conversion is the most telling omission in his autobiography. It turns his book into something like *Brideshead Revisited* without Lord Marchmain making the sign of the cross or a remake of *King Kong* without the monkey. It is one more instance

of the suppression of the truth that is characteristic of the prudence of the flesh and leads to death of the spirit and the futility of any political movement based on it.

Sam chose *logos* in the end. It's up to us to choose it now, because as I said then:

> All we have is various ethnic traditions and communities—Sam Francis's South, my ethnic neighborhoods—united by the frail bonds of Logos as perceived by a human soul so beset by human passion. Even if our souls are weak, however, Logos is not. Logos is the glue that holds the universe together, and so it is strong enough to unite us as Americans whether it be the higher Logos which acknowledges Christ as Lord of the universe or the lower Logos which honors him by seeing this order in the works of creation or in the moral law. We are the party of Logos, and it is only as such that we can think of surviving much less prevailing over our enemies.

Chapter Five

Faking Woodstock

As if by clockwork, every ten years we are treated either to a reenactment of or a piece of art celebrating the cultural mayhem known as Woodstock. Woodstock 99 dissolved into an ugly riot at which scores of women were raped and the semis containing food and equipment for the "festival" were burned into twisted smoking hulks. Oddly enough, there were no documentaries celebrating the days of peace and love at Woodstock 99. Like the river that has to flow 20 miles to clean up its own pollution, the apologists for the culture of sex, drugs, and rock 'n' roll had to wait ten years before attempting to resurrect the icon of the baby boomer generation.

This time it was Ang Lee's turn to save the appearances. The regime of sex, drugs, and rock 'n' roll has become an increasingly onerous iron boot on the neck of the populace at large and hence in need of some spin. Hence, Ang Lee's attempt to make the current regime palatable by tracing its origins to the Age of Aquarius. Sexual liberation is the most effective form of political control devised by the mind of man, but it only works under certain conditions. In cultures where religion is strong, the reach of the manipulators of appetite is limited; hence, the need to wage actual (not cultural) war on Islam.

Now after years of cultural subversion, the word is getting out; the natives are getting restless. The natives are beginning to understand that the only "freedom" that any one has left is the freedom to be sexually deviant. Once it becomes apparent that sexual deviance is bondage which darkens the mind and renders large numbers of people docile, it is equally apparent that the regime has a stake in promoting sexual deviance. Hence, movies like Ang Lee's *Taking Woodstock*, which tries to shore up the diminishing conviction that sex, drugs, and rock 'n' roll were liberating and not the exact opposite. *Taking Woodstock* is one more attempt to preserve the fiction that Woodstock was about peace and love. It is a shameless piece of propaganda for the Dionysian regime of sexual liberation as a form of political control.

Ang Lee's film is not just propaganda; it is an attempt to rewrite history as well. The film inherited this project from the book of the same name, written by Elliot Tiber,[1] aka, Eliyahu Teichberg, upon which it is based. Teichberg's

parents bought a motel in Bethel, New York in 1955, and for the next 14 years struggled to make mortgage payments as the Jewish clientele from New York City voted with their feet in the direction of Miami Beach. Aggravating this decline was the way hoteliers like Teichberg's mother treated their clients, expecting them to pay in advance for beds with filthy sheets and non-existent air conditioners and telephones. The big hotels, like Grossinger's and The Concord, soldiered on, but they refused to refer their clients to places like the Teichberg's El Monaco: "Elaine Grossinger," Tiber writes, "soon stopped sending people because too many complained afterward."[2]

According to Tiber's rewriting of history, "One of the great benefits of Woodstock—a benefit that, to my knowledge has never been written about—was its sexual diversity." The reason it hasn't been written about is because it doesn't exist. There was no sexual diversity at Woodstock. During the age of Aquarius, homosexuality was the butt of jokes, not a sacred cause. As of 1969, when I was 21 years old and stuck in traffic on my way to Woodstock, homosexuals were considered either predatory older men who drove around late at night trying to pick up hitchhikers, or people of the same age who were afraid of girls. Either way they were holed up in the secret societies which were the descendents of quasi-Masonic operations like the Cambridge Apostles, and not involved in mass gatherings like Woodstock. I remember listening to a folk singer singing his parody version of a famous Peter, Paul and Mary tune. His version was called "Puff, the Tragic Faggot." Then, unlike now, the counterculture thought homosexuality was funny.

Ang Lee tries to play up the diversity angle by portraying a gaggle of nuns walking toward the concert. Tiber takes the same idea to even more ridiculous heights when he writes:

> There were Christians, Jews, Muslims, Hindus, and sects of all kinds, all cohabiting on blankets and in tents, all with the same intention: To enjoy and be uplifted by the music and its vision.

Muslims at Woodstock? The idea is preposterous. Evidently Tiber is still smoking the same stuff he was smoking 40 years ago, and having the same sort of hallucinations. Not only was there no sexual diversity, there was no diversity in general among the Woodstock generation. Woodstock was if anything a flight from diversity. It was a coming together. It was the birth of a new nation, Woodstock Nation, the first of many pseudo-ethnic consumer groups based on consumption of a particular product, in this case records. Woodstock Nation was the ancestor to Harley riders and NASCAR dads. Not only were there no Muslims there, there were no Jews, no Catholics, and no Protestants there either, because everyone there was fleeing some lesser identity of the sort manifested by their parents and their parents' religious affiliation. Woodstock Nation was, in short, one blue-jean clad undifferentiated mass of people who were deliberately trying to escape something which they identified

with their parents' generation, something which they perceived as vaguely ethnic and but mostly American, in the bad sense of the word. Woodstock was, of course, as American as apple pie, or The Great Awakening, but like the revivals which swept through the Connecticut River Valley in the 18th century and New York's Burned Over district in the 19th, it was not diverse. Diversity arrived on the cultural scene around the time that my oldest child was in college. I remember being at Harvard during the 1991 graduation ceremonies and noticing the word "diversity" on black, helium filled balloons carried by the faculty. I remember no such thing at Woodstock. Woodstock was about unity, not diversity.

Taking Woodstock is revisionist in other ways as well, but before long the desire to be revisionist and the propagandistic impulse behind the film merge into one increasingly implausible story whose purpose is to take our minds off the loss of actual freedom which has followed in the wake of sexual liberation. Freedom is never free, and Woodstock is no exception to that rule. The only plausible part of the story is the part dealing with the role played by the Jews from New York City, but that angle gets absorbed into another overarching narrative, namely, the promotion of homosexuality, and so ultimately *Taking Woodstock* becomes a conflation of two stories that can be summed up in one thesis statement: how the Revolutionary Jew liberated us to act on our homosexual impulses. The film and the book share that message. The film, however, is a radically censored version of the story Tiber tells in his book.

To create a successful propaganda piece, Lee had to modify Tiber's story. The actor portraying Tiber in the film looks ten to fifteen years younger than Tiber was. Lee also decided to leave out significant sections of Tiber's book, in fact all of the book which deals with Tiber's homosexual life in New York City. In the movie, Elliot Tiber is a 20 year old naif; in the book he is a 34-year-old sado-masochist who is a regular patron of gay sex bars like The Mine Shaft. Lee's deliberate exclusion of half of Tiber's book raises a number of questions: If there is nothing wrong with Tiber's other life—the premise of the movie—then why was it deliberately excluded from a movie whose purpose is to extol it? On the other hand, if there is something wrong with it, why are you making a movie about it?

Ang Lee's movie fails on any number of levels, but the most basic reason for failure is discomfort with the material in the book. Lee seems to be admitting that the homo stuff has a message all of its own and that it is so transgressive that it can't be redeemed by soft focus and discrete camera angles. Homosexuality is simply not compatible with love stories of the sort that most people are interested in seeing. This puts the filmmakers who choose homosexual themes in a bind. To tell an interesting story, they have to falsify the material. They can never be honest about homosexuality because it is so degrading and dehumanizing that it explodes any possible plot line. If this guy is willing to do this sort of stuff, why should we be interested in

what happens to him? That's the sort of question that pops into the mind of normal people when confronted with the standard homosexual narrative. Beyond that, homosexuality defeats plot because it is based on a negation of social interaction. This comes out in Tiber's book, but not in Ang Lee's movie. After a sexual encounter with Robert Mapplethorpe, Tiber made the mistake of actually wanting to converse with the man he had just had sex with, a *faux pas* which Mapplethorpe quickly rectified when he informed Tiber: "I've got other plans, and they don't include becoming pals. I don't want to know anything about your fucking motel or the rest of your life."[3] Tiber then opines:

> That pretty much summed up my sexual history. People with whom I had sex always pretended that they didn't know me when they saw me in the light of day. It had been that way ever since I was a kid.

As if suppressing passages like this weren't bad enough, Lee concluded that *Taking Woodstock* was going to be a comedy. This lapse in judgment is in keeping with everything else in a film, that gets it wrong on just about everything. *Taking Woodstock* is not even remotely funny, which is a significant flaw in a movie that aspires to be a comedy. The idea of a Chinaman doing stand up comedy on the Borscht Circuit in the Catskills is full of humorous possibilities, but only as a gag in the mind of someone like Mel Brooks. Ang Lee, who has shown his sympathy for the homosexual cause in *Brokeback Mountain*, chose a book which is not even funny in the way that Mel Brooks tries to be funny. It is full of gags which revolve around ethnic prejudice. This means that even in moments when the book is clever, there is a residue of hatred left behind, as when Tiber describes the dumb *goyim* living in White Lake, that checks our impulse to laugh. Maybe Jews find this sort of thing funny, but any *goy* who laughs at this book is laughing at his own expense.

Tiber's book is suffused with a sense of grievance, in fact double grievance. Tiber feels that the world hates him because he is a Jew and a homosexual. A typical *goy* in Teichberg's eyes is Bella Manifelli, a local woman of Italian extraction who "visited our little office—dressed as always in her curlers, housecoat, and slippers." Tiber is never shy about giving us the cues we need to evaluate the moral worth of the characters he is presenting. Bella, we are told, was typical of the locals, who

> would come by our place and paint swastikas on the wall of the Presidential Wing. They then started decorating the walls with warm-hearted little phrases such as, "We're going to burn down your motel, you dirty stinking Jews."

Bella is, if anything, more eloquent than the average resident of White Lake. As Tiber puts it,

> she chose to call us a number of names: Communists, kidnappers, liberals, Christ killers, mother fuckers, faggots, bus-pass abusers, and of

> course the worst word in that vast vocabulary of hers, the three letter special, "Jew."[4]

At another point one of the locals tells Tiber, "You Jew bastard. You think we're going to stand by and let you ruin this town? We'll run you out and all those dirty hippies with you before we let this happen."

Tiber, of course, rejoices to take note of such things because it allows him to feel morally superior to the locals on two counts, namely, because he is a Jew and because he is a homosexual. Strangely, Tiber never had misgivings when the same sort of thing happened in the homosexual demi-monde. After the sexual encounter with Robert Mapplethorpe in The Mine Shaft, Tiber followed Mapplethorpe back to his apartment, where, lo and behold, "hanging from one wall was an enormous Nazi flag." This and Mapplethorpe's desire to have Tiber dress up as a Gestapo officer did not prevent Tiber from having another day of drug-fueled sex with him. When Mapplethorpe then tells Tiber, "Clean yourself up, you fucking kike. You smell like a fucking toilet,"[5] there is no indignation of the sort reserved for the residents of White Lake. Instead, Tiber finds this sort of anti-Semitism sexually exciting. All that he can think to say after being called a kike by Mapplethorpe is, "I fairly swooned."[6]

Tiber, it should be remembered, was a resident of White Lake, where his parents owned a motel. He used that residency to become head of the local Chamber of Commerce, a position he exploited by getting a permit for the rock festival that then threatened to destroy the town. He was also hired to be the local PR man by virtue of his residence in White Lake, and yet when a reporter asks him, "What do your people think 100,000 hippies will do to White Lake?"[7] He responds: "My people?" he asked, "Native White Lakians cannot be considered people—mine or anyone else's." Tiber said this after smoking a significant amount of marijuana, but the drug acted, if anything, like a truth serum: "Something in the still-functioning part of my brain realized that I had lost all capacity to censor myself." At this point it is difficult to tell why Tiber is so obnoxious. Is it because he's a Jew? Or is it because he's a homosexual? Or is there some especially powerful synergy going on when we're dealing with a Jewish homosexual?

Whatever the reason, before long, the reader finds himself first sympathizing with and then cheering on the locals whom Tiber sets out to demonize as hopeless bigots. Maybe there was something to be said for their point of view after all, as when they claimed of the Jews (or at least the Teichbergs):

> We were trespassing, we were a fire hazard, we were a morals hazard, we were a health hazard. . . . We were the ones who turned all those hippies loose on White Lake. . . . They . . . were loitering in front of the cinema, preventing respectable God-fearing Christians from seeing the films.[8]

All of this is, of course, true. His parents' motel was a fire hazard, and Tiber himself was both a health hazard and a morals hazard, and yet, Tiber thinks that we are going to sympathize with his cause. He feels this way because he feels confident that, as a Jew, he can manipulate discourse, but as with Ang Lee and his idea that this movie is funny, the material ultimately backfires on Tiber, and we find ourselves rooting for the locals and against the New York Jews who think that they can steamroller all opposition to their cultural program of "creative destruction."

What passes for humor in *Taking Woodstock* is always at the expense of the *goyim*, which is another way of saying that Tiber is an especially obnoxious kind of Jew. His Jewish xenophobia and ethnocentrism is magnified by his homosexuality into something approaching the grotesque; he's not funny no matter how hard he tries to be.

Jews stopped being funny a long time ago. Think of Woody Allen and Philip Roth. When was the last time either of them said anything even remotely funny? In the case of Philip Roth, that question is fairly simple to answer. It was in 1969, the year that gave us both Woodstock and the publication of *Portnoy's Complaint.*

Taking Woodstock is not about the people who went to Woodstock. It is about the people who created Woodstock, and they were drawn from a specific group of people, namely Jews from New York City born during the 1930s. This is certainly a group with a lot of clout, especially in the media, but it was not the group that went to Woodstock, most of whom were Christian and heterosexual, and at least 14 years younger than Tiber. Tiber was born in 1935, which makes him nine years older than the oldest baby boomer and old enough to be the father of the youngest. Tiber admits as much when he writes: "These people were not the New Yorkers I had been used to dealing with all my life. They weren't materialistic or hungry for fortune or fame. . . . They were long-haired, denim-clad, loose-hipped, barefooted, bandanaed and free."

As if that conflation weren't bad enough, Tiber then goes on to conflate Jews of his generation and sexual deviance, in particular homosexuality. We're talking about second generation Jews, the generation born in the '30s. This generation had is own peculiar set of characteristics. The financial strain of the Great Depression is one; screwed up childhood is another. Irving Louis Horowitz, who was not a homosexual, would probably second Tiber's account of Jewish family life in New York City in the '30s. His account of cheating the *shvartzes* in Harlem corresponds to Tiber's account of cheating the *goyim* in White Lake. The main characteristic of both households was avarice and lack of love:

> Like everyone else, I learned what love was at home. And my experience of "love" was in fact, manipulation and violence. Both were sugar-coated

> with the pretense of family and caring. Actually, no one in my family used the word love in connection with other family members. We "loved" chocolate, and we "loved" our television set. But we never said that we loved each other, and certainly no one in our family was treated with any real love. My early experiences with sex were not much different. The sexual pleasures, arousal, touch, and orgasm were all very real, but they came from strangers and, in fact, as various forms of molestation.

Tiber attacks psychoanalysis for presuming to change homosexuals:

> There was also a belief that homosexuality was a choice that we could control – if we wanted to. Many so-called therapists and clergy thought that some people chose to be gay because they were evil. Hence the attraction to an evil lifestyle. This belief gave license to all kinds of hate crimes against human beings whose only offense was a sexual orientation over which they had no control.

But Tiber's book depicts a classic case of the psychoanalytical explanation of homosexuality, namely, dominant mother/weak or distant father. Tiber's father is a nebbish; Tiber's mother is an avaricious monster, right out of Karl Marx's *Zur Judenfrage*. "The only time I ever saw her smile," Tiber writes of his mother, "was when the day's receipts were good." Tiber's mother would urge his father to beat him and then become overly intimate after the beating by way of compensation:

> She drew me into some kind of bizarre conspiracy against my father. He had punished me—at her bidding, no less—but now Momma and I were friends and Pop was the outsider, the bad guy. . . . That was the closest thing I ever got to a mother's love—those intimate moments after the punishment, the welts still fresh on my body, when she served me her stew. She actually succeeded in doubling my guilt, as only she could. . . . Deep down I knew something was wrong here.[9]

But what exactly did Tiber learn from his mother? Tiber's mother hated everything to do with Woodstock:

> I hated all those kids with their dirty sex and drugs—kids who should be home with their mothers. I hate the music too. I was ashamed you were there. I don't know why you are reminding people who you were and where you are now. They will blame you because you were the one who made Woodstock happen. I am ashamed of you and Woodstock.

At moments like this, it's difficult not to like Mrs. Teichberg. She had a hard life, walking, as she repeatedly told everyone, from Minsk to New York City in 1912 through 20 foot drifts of snow. Her hard life guaranteed that she reacted naturally to certain things, which she perceived as either good or bad. But whatever nature had inscribed in her was overwritten by a bad Talmudic instruction that turned everything into an occasion for making

money. When the hippies took off their clothes on the front lawn of the motel, Mrs. Teichberg's first reaction was to cover them up, but when that failed her second reaction was to make money off the spectacle by renting chairs to passersby who stopped to witness the commotion and watch the crazy naked dancers. "It's a preview of their dance performance," Momma told them. "What do you think, darling, they dance for free?"

By the early part of 1969, the Teichbergs "were the proud owners of New York's ugliest and most dysfunctional motel and resort." Taking his cue from his mother, Tiber attempted to make money from sexual deviance because it was cheaper than washing the sheets:

> I created a bar and had topless waiters—21-year-old boys wearing bikini underwear—serve the clientele, most of who were women. In order to add a little excitement and fun, I placed a large board in the men's room with plenty of colorful magic markers so that the men could write all kinds of erotic graffiti. I then told the women that if they bought a drink at midnight, they could go into the men's room and read what the men had written.

In retrospect, the only thing Tiber regretted about his attempt to subvert the morals of White Lake and everyone who stayed at the Teichbergs' motel was that "The bar was too small to make any real money." In his failed attempt to make money by running ads in *The Village Voice* for a "a swingin' singles night," all Tiber succeeded in doing was attracting "lots of losers, drunks, and misfits" to White Lake, lowering the level of public decency considerably in the process.

Tiber's problems are theological as well as moral, something the Teichbergs exacerbated when they sent young Eliyahu off to a Yeshiva. The study of the Talmud turned Tiber's psychological problems into theological problems. Tiber described his time at the Yeshiva studying the Talmud as:

> a living hell—eight hours a day studying an ancient language and Talmudic laws governing cows that wander onto your front yard. . . . Fear permeated the entire deal—fear of Moses and all of his laws, which you couldn't help but break, and fear of that "jealous" and "vengeful" God, who regularly got pissed off and sent plagues upon fat little Yeshiva students who denied His existence. At the age of five, I announced my atheism, much to the chagrin of the rabbis who taught me.[10]

God, as Sigmund Freud pointed out, is an exalted father. In Tiber's case, the weak father led to atheism, but that combined with the dominant, avaricious mother led to homosexuality. When Tiber's father deprivation got sexualized during sexual encounters in movie theaters, he contracted a life-long bad habit of sexual deviance. This, in turn, led to the double life common among homosexuals of that era:

> In White Lake, I was a loser, a schlemiel, an uneasy and closeted gay man whose cover was always in danger of being blown. But in New York . . . I was . . . part of the avant-garde community of designers, painters, photographers, actors and writers who shaped the tastes for all of America. . . . I was a gay artist posing as a straight businessman, and that alone would make a sane person crazy.

Tiber tried to deal with stress associated with leading a double life by making cryptic signs and placing them around the motel.

> On the property I hung little signs on the motel walls, or posted them in the weeds. "Degenerates Welcome," "S&M Lovers Club," and Eagle's Nest. The Eagle's Nest was a gay club in Greenwich Village, but only gays knew that.[11]

Tiber's life deserves a chapter in Kraft-Ebbing's book, but knowing that something is wrong and explaining what is wrong are two different things. It wasn't just Tiber who was confused. Everyone he knew, which is to say the generation of American Jews who were born in the 1930s and grew up in New York, was confused:

> Psychoanalysts wanted us to believe that it was an aberration of our upbringing, a psychological disorder resulting from distorted relationships with mother and father. I fit the bill perfectly—but so did all of my straight friends. In fact I didn't know a single gay or straight human being whom didn't have a screwed up childhood.

This meant that when this group of people came into positions of power in the culture, as they did beginning in 1969, the dominant culture was going to be in for a bad time.

As of 1969, the double life being led by many New York Jews in Tiber's situation was becoming intolerable. Because they were Jews, they saw the solution not in repentance but in revolution. There was a natural affinity, in other words, between being a Jewish homosexual and a Jewish revolutionary. Or as Tiber puts it:

> When society hates you for your sexual behavior, sex becomes a revolutionary act and for many, an act of anger. It is a raised middle finger, a thumb in the eye to all those who despise you. It confirms difference. It insists on the right to life.

Not that Tiber or his cohort were against abortion:

> We were a community apart, an underground that unfortunately was festering with anger, feelings of profound injustice, and an acquired and perpetual disavowal of self.

Just what type of community is it that solicits anonymous sex in men's rooms and has no desire to associate with the people it has sex with? The answer

is no community at all. What we are talking about is a demimonde, not a community. The homosexual demimonde was a group of outcasts who hated society at large because of the nature of their sexual activity. E. M. Forster captures the psychology of this demimonde well in his homosexual novel *Maurice*. The homosexual "community" is what Karl Marx would refer to as "*Lumpen*," as in the "Lumpenproletariat." What we're talking about, in other words, is a despised minority with a grudge against the majority. In this regard, the homosexuals had a natural affinity with the Jews. What happened in 1969 is a replay of the Black-Jewish alliance that began in 1909 with the founding of the NAACP, only this time the Jews turned the homosexuals into revolutionaries. Put another way, the homosexuals stopped acting like Cambridge Apostles and, abandoning quasi-Masonic clubs like The Mattachine Society, started acting like revolutionary Jews. The presence of Jews like Elliot Tiber and the other members of his generation with equally screwed up childhoods in this demimonde facilitated this transformation.

On the evening of June 28, 1969, Tiber was cruising at a homosexual bar on Christopher Street called the Stonewall Inn, when suddenly the cops arrived. Instead of running out the back door, the homosexuals pushed a juke box against the front door and denied the cops access to the bar. Before long the mood changed, and the homosexuals removed their own barricade and sallied forth into the street to attack the cops. This event has been taken ever since as the beginning of the gay rights movement: "That night, which came to be known as he Stonewall Rebellion," Tiber tells us, "gave birth to the Gay Liberation movement. It changed the entire country and a great deal of the world."[12]

Nineteen sixty-nine was a significant year for a number of reasons. The Black-Jewish alliance had collapsed in 1967 with the publication of Harold Cruse's book *The Crisis of the Negro Intellectual*, but the fall out from that event reached its culmination at the end of 1969 when the FBI brought its COINTELPRO operation against the Black Panthers to its conclusion with an attack on Black Panther Headquarters in Chicago which resulted in the death of Fred Hampton. With the collapse of the Civil Rights Movement, the Jewish revolutionaries who had not converted to Zionism in the aftermath of the 1967 Arab-Israeli war were looking for another revolutionary avant garde. They found it among the homosexuals of the New York City.

Given their upbringing and given the demographics of New York City in the wake of the huge migration of Jews from the Pale of the Settlement during the period which began with the murder of Czar Alexander I and ended with the Immigration acts of 1924, it was clear that the homosexual population of New York City was going to contain a significant number of Jews. What happened to the homosexuals is the same thing that happened to White Lake. The Jews turned homosexuality into the avant garde of the revolutionary movement, a position recently vacated by the nation's Negroes.

Tiber clearly portrays the Stonewall Riot as a revolutionary insurrection. After one of the homosexuals at the Stonewall yelled, "tonight, we're fighting back!" Tiber is quick to draw the conclusion that "Now suddenly there was the smell of revolution in the air."[13] Homosexuals were natural revolutionaries because, like Marx's Lumpenproletariat, they were criminals, or as Tiber put it:

> Being gay meant that in a deep part of your being, in some fundamental place that you recognize as your most vulnerable and true self, you are inherently guilty of being a criminal.[14]

Revolution was a way of solving the dilemma of the double life and the feeling of alienation that went with it. As Tiber put it,

> The thrill of tossing a cop car gave me a feeling of power I had never experienced before. Those around me felt the same. We were wide-eyed with power and ready to fight. . . . We were ready to take over Greenwich Village. . . . For the first time in my life, I was proud to be gay.[15]

Revolution was doubly attractive to the homosexuals who were also Jews, because Jews had been revolutionaries ever since Annas and Caiaphas had told Jesus to come down from the cross. Revolution was always the solution to Jewish problems, which were never of their own making. Stonewall came at exactly the right moment. Philip Roth had articulated the sexual consequences of how his generation of Jews had been raised in the '30s when *Portnoy's Complaint* came out in early 1969. Disillusionment with the ungrateful *shvartzes* for all that the Jews had done for them during the Civil Rights Movement suddenly found release with the unleashing of a new revolution, one in which Jews were protagonists once again and not merely support staff as they had been during the Civil Rights Movement. Beyond that, the Jewish homosexuals who were suffering the psychological consequences of living a double life found psychological release as well. New York, as Tiber put it, "was radically transformed." In fact, "June 28, 1969 had changed the world—and me with it. Suddenly, all the rage that I had turned against myself was focused outward for a just cause."[16]

What we're really talking about here is the Jewish takeover of deviance and its mobilization as first a revolutionary movement and then as a form of thought control after the revolution succeeded.

The real hero of this story, in other words, is not the homosexual. The real hero is the revolutionary Jew. In *Taking Woodstock*, the Revolutionary Jew is embodied in the form of Mike Lang, one of the four promoters of Woodstock.

On June 15, 1969, Teichberg "arranged a series of white sheets on the ground to form a large cross," and "waited for the day when they [i.e., the revolutionary Jews from New York City] would suddenly appear out of the

sky." If Tiber could be said to have a religion, its closest relative was the Cargo Cults of New Guinea.

As if in answer to a Jewish revolutionary's prayer, Mike Lang descended like a god from the sky: "A door slid open and out jumped a young man with long brown hair." Mike Lang was Tiber's version of the *deus ex machina*, the *machina* in question being a helicopter: "When the helicopter hovered above us," Tiber writes, "it occurred to me that this kind of entrance was reserved for mythic heroes. . . . No, Homer himself could not have conjured up something more elaborate, nor more appropriate, for the man who jumped out of the fuselage and was now walking toward me." "Woodstock," Tiber writes, continuing with the Cargo Cult metaphor, "was like some kind of UFO that had landed and released armies of the sexually liberated in the very uptight town of Bethel [where] I had been suffocating in the closet for 14 years."

After Lang's helicopter landed, the Earthlight Players, a group of Seven Sisters alumnae who specialized in doing Chekhov in the nude, "stripped off all their clothes and painted their bodies with lipstick and mud," succumbing to the Cargo Cult mentality Teichberg had engendered when he wrote, "It was as if the cavalry were coming to my rescue. Oh, bring money, cavalry, bring money!"[17]

Mike Lang evidently heard Tiber's prayer. He brought lots of money, in the form of cash in shopping bags, which he then began lavishing on people like Tiber and his parents as a way of bringing the cultural revolution to the natives of White Lake, New York. "Mike had his ways, to be sure," Tiber writes. "And one of them, of course, was money, and he had a lot of it."

Mike Lang, in other words, was the latest avatar of the various Messiah the Jews had come to worship ever since they rejected Jesus Christ, and Woodstock was the name of the religion that this revolutionary Jew had brought to liberate the dumb *goyim* in White Lake. Mike Lang was, in this regard, a lot like Shabbetai Zevi, because he liberated Jews and gentiles alike from their bondage to the moral law. The effect, according to Tiber, was almost immediate. As soon as "the Woodstockers arrived, everyone was flirting and coming on to everyone else, including the gays—even in broad daylight."[18] Mike Lang, like Shabbetai Zevi, brought life to his people: "Suddenly there was life at the El Monaco. This run-down third rate hotel was the center of the universe." The arrival of Lang the Messiah and Woodstock his religion fills Tiber, the atheist, with religious zeal, "causing me to be born again. For the first time in my life, I felt that people understood me."[19] After years of being encapsulated in his double life as a homosexual, Tiber suddenly feels that he "was part of all of these people, the great sea of humanity."[20]

The Jews are going to save America by bringing about a revolution. Like Shabbetai Zevi, Mike Lang changed the rules: "All the rules were different now. . . . " Tiber's description of Lang has uncanny similarities to Gershom

Sholem's equally adulatory description of Shabbetai Zevi. Both men proved that Messianic Jewish leaders could create movements that took on lives of their own:

> Woodstock proved that when there is strength in numbers, people can exercise freedoms that are otherwise unavailable to them, especially if those freedoms harm no one the young people who came to Woodstock smoked marijuana and took drugs out in the open. They took off their clothes in public and swam naked in ponds and lakes. The walked over to the bushes and made love.[21]

Lang was also going liberate Jewish *schlemiels* like Tiber's father, transforming him from "the quintessential blue collar worker" into a "king." ("After a lifetime of frustration and failure, he was ready for the big dance. This was his hurrah, too"). Tiber's father was now capable of "sending me love," solely because of the arrival of Mike Lang, the revolutionary Jew, who following in the footsteps of Shabbetai Zevi, had unleashed "great whirlwind of music and power," that "had swept into our town and changed us all."

Mike Lang was even having an effect on Mrs. Teichberg, who was now "in heaven, counting cash, depositing some of it, and hiding more in her secret places."

If anyone needed proof that Mike Lang was the Messiah, it could be found in the fact that money was now flowing in abundance. The net result of all of the money and drugs the Jewish revolutionaries had brought with them to up-tight White Lake was unmistakable. Even Mrs. Teichberg

> was definitely becoming more human. She wasn't so shrill, and she wasn't so tight with money. I had never seen here so relaxed and, at time, genuinely generous with people—at least compared to what she had been before. She wasn't charging for every piece of soap or towel anymore. This was for her, some weird form of charity. Truly, I marveled at this transformation. I only hoped it would live on after the festival was over.[22]

Mr. Teichberg is also saved by becoming a revolutionary Jew like Mike Lang, and it is money, the sacrament at the heart of the Jewish religion, as Karl Marx put it, which brings about the transformation:

> This was a man who had spent his life bent over . . . and defeated, not just by life's challenges but by a wife who berated him daily. Now he was king of the castle . . . . He was making daily trips to the bank with bags of cash.

When it comes to the Jewish religion, in other words, money and salvation are one and the same thing. Tiber even names one of his chapters "The World is Made Anew," his translation of "*Tikkun Olam*." In it we read that three of the four promoters of Woodstock are Jews. Like Mike Lang they are all machers, as evidenced by the "parade of limousines, Porsches,

Corvettes and motorcycles—all carrying Woodstock staff members—[which] began rumbling into town."[23] That group included Joel Rosenman, who was "instantly impressive. He had dark hair, dark eyes, a prominent nose, a wide smile and a big mustache that reminded me a little of a Mexican bandito." Like Roberts (the only *goy* among the promoters), Rosenman was "an Ivy Leaguer" who "looked like power and money to me."[24] The other Jewish macher was Artie Kornfeld, then vice president of Capitol Records. Kornfeld, according to the goggle-eyed Teichberg, "was famous for smoking hash in his office and for writing thirty hit pop songs."

All the big Jews needed to do was convince the locals that revolution was in their best interest even if the concert they were promoting threatened to destroy their town and their way of life along with it. Lang proposed to do this in the Jewish manner, which is to say, with money.

When Teichberg and Lang showed up at the local bank, the bank president tells them, "We don't deal with subversives. Do you understand me, Elliott?"[25] At this point Lang allows the bank president a peek into his shopping bag, the one containing $250,000 in cash, whereupon said bank president "changes his tune, . . . kicks the locals out" of his bank and shows "undying respect, admiration and support." In fact, after it became clear that the Jews from New York City were packing serious money, "Everyone who worked for the bank was all smiles and quick to utter sycophantic greetings when the curly haired Mr. Lang entered the bank."[26]

This sets up the main conflict in the book, which is Jew Money vs. Local Culture. Not everyone was as sycophantic as the employees of the local bank. "The locals," Tiber tells us, "were used to the quiet tranquility of open spaces and daily routines, which were the source of their security." Judging from the evidence which Tiber presents in his own book, the locals were perfectly justified in their fears. After Tiber showed Lang and co. the wetlands behind the motel property as a potential concert site, Lang turned to Stan Goldstein, head of security for the concert and asked, "Couldn't we get a dozen bulldozers in here and level it?" Afraid that he might lose the chance to put the concert on, Teichberg goes Lang one better: "I told them they could nuke the whole fuckin' place to oblivion and put on the concert atop the ashes."

Given attitudes like this, it is not surprising that, as Tiber puts it, "The locals were on the brink of panic" and threatened to revoke the permit for the concert. Yet, Tiber still can't understand why the residents of White Lake aren't more eager to destroy their own town in the interests of the cultural revolution. On his way to the town council meeting in the Woodstockers' limousine, Tiber waxes pensive:

> You'd think that this bombed out highway would be enough to convince the locals of how badly we needed the money. But no. What they were most concerned about was what the hippies might do to their lawns and lake, and how helpless they were to protect themselves from the madness.

Tiber then gives his take on democracy, as manifested by

> Your average Bethel Town Council meeting, where four or five cranky old men showed up to vote "No" to everything except buses with curtains. This was more like a throwback to the days of the Salem witch trials. And guess who the witches were.

At the town council meeting, Tiber tried to assuage the fears of the locals by claiming

> We can become something like Tanglewood in Massachusetts, or Edinburgh, Scotland. We could have year round tourist trade, with national attention and respect. It will bring the town back from the dead. . . . Do you realize that you are looking at a way in which every person in this town can get rich?[27]

But the locals remained unpersuaded. Evidently, there were some things about local culture that were not going to be made better by money, no matter how much of it the Jews offered to shower on the town.

"We don't see things that way," one local responded. "These dirty hippies are destroying the town. They're having sex in the lake, they're parading around naked out in the open. Next thing you know, women will start getting raped [as at Woodstock 99]. Then what? People all over town are complaining to the council and demanding that we shut the thing down. We've got to do something, and we've got to do it now."

Tiber finds the notion that there is something in White Lake that money can't buy incomprehensible. When confronted with something he can't understand, Tiber invariably falls back on the Jewish universal explanation for everything. The people in White Lake are "a lot of dug-in bigots who didn't want outsiders like hippies and Jews to infiltrate and pollute their little patch of paradise." The thought of anti-Semitism as the explanation for everything no sooner crosses Tiber's mind than it is verified by reality:

> Before I could get a word out of my mouth, a man in overalls and a five-o'clock shadow stood up and called upon Lucifer to curse me and take me to hell. . . . Exterminate that permit and Elliot Tiber and the Chamber of Commerce with it! Then go out to Yasgur's farm and arrest every single person who isn't a resident.[28]

Did that man in overalls really say "Exterminate that permit"? Or is Tiber putting words in his mouth, words that are to remind everyone of the Holocaust? We'll never know. Either way, the point of having the man talk this way is clear. Anyone who opposes the Jews' attempt to make money, overturn local culture, or spread their notion of "liberation," in short anyone who opposes Jewish revolutionary fervor, is a Nazi. Or, better, a bad Nazi, as opposed to Good Nazis like Robert Mapplethorpe, who can display Nazi flags

in their apartment and call Tiber a kike with impunity because they are on the side of cultural decadence and dissolution.

Faced with local intransigence, the New York Jews go to Plan B, which like Plan A involves money. With the locals yelling "Corruption! Mafia! Commies! Degenerates! Perverts!" and "getting dangerously close to throwing a rope over a thick tree limb," Mike Lang spread oil on troubled waters when he "uttered a magical sentence: 'We will give the town of Bethel $25,000 to be used in any way you deem appropriate after the festival is over.'" "At the mention of the money," Tiber writes, "the booing and catcalls briefly subsided."

When Mike Lang's offer of $25,000 failed to placate the locals, he moved to plan C, which meant that he "contacted his lawyers," who then made clear to the locals that "Woodstock Ventures would sue their asses into oblivion if they made any effort to stop the concert."

For some reason unclear to Tiber, this gesture caused the mood to turn "uglier." In fact, people started yelling, "Jewish greed! Boycott Yasgur's dairy."[29] So great was the totally unprovoked anger of the locals that "the president of the council told the audience that the meeting was adjourned" because he was "terrified that a riot might break out." This would have been a bad riot, because it, unlike what happened at Stonewall, which was a good riot, impeded the plans of the cultural revolutionaries.

Unsure that their strategy of legal intimidation was going to work, the Woodstockers moved on to Plan D. They gave Tiber money to bribe the council members, something he carried out in the middle of the town lake in a rowboat under the cover of dark. Bribery, as I pointed out in my chapter on the Reuchin vs. Pfefferkorn controversy in *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* has always been considered a Talmudically approved way of dealing with intransigent public officials. For the nonce, it looked as if that age-old wisdom was working. After handing out the money, Tiber tells us that "I rolled a very big joint and drew on it until it made me forget all about boats and envelopes and crazy people who hated rock and roll."

Tiber is a notorious name-dropper throughout his book; however, strangely, he doesn't give the names of the officials he bribed. The only names which appear are those of figures who are deceased and in no position to sue him or contradict his story. In fact, the point of this book is that local officials had no story. They were simply anti-Semitic bigots, and that was the end of the story. Or was it? At certain points in his book, Tiber indicates that the town council members may have had a point in worrying about 500,000 drug crazed hippies arriving in town, as when he admits

> If the crowd turned angry or violent, the only force capable of restoring order would have been the National Guard. All of us began to realize that we were sitting on a dormant volcano which, if hot handled properly, *could destroy much of the region.*[30]

Tiber admits more than once that the situation was out of control, as when he writes that: "Everyone in Bethel knew that they had lost control of events. Many were willing to ride the wave, but most were just plain terrified,"[31] but calls the town council members, who are government officials responsible for public safety, bigots for wanting to act on that admission.

When a truck-load of food showed up at the Teichbergs' motel, "a mob consisting of a few hundred people arrived and raced toward the trucks, ready to tear off the doors and take whatever they could find."[32] And yet when the town council threatened to declare a state of emergency and ask Governor Rockefeller to send in the National Guard, all that Tiber can think to say is that he had bribed them and wonder why they weren't staying bribed: "What's the matter?" I asked them. Didn't you get enough money? Do you want more, is that what you want?" To which, the locals respond just as predictably: "You Jews are making big bucks here. You pulled a fast one on us and you're not going to get away with it." In other words, the locals are greedier than the Jews, and hypocritical to boot.

When it looks as if the bribery scheme is going to unravel, Mike Lang then goes to Plan E. He calls in the Jewish controlled media and sics them on the locals. Lang takes Tiber to the NBC media center at the El Monaco Motel and instructs him to go on national TV and Radio and "Tell them about those rotten politicos, man. . . . Tell them it's the birth of a new nation, the Woodstock Nation. Use your own words, just make sure that they know to come up now."

Tiber is eager to follow Lang's instructions: "I realized instantly what Mike was getting at. He knew that the more people who came to the festival, the less power the town council—or even the governor—would have to stop it." And so Tiber goes on the air and announces that the concert will henceforth be free because: "This is more than a music and arts festival. This is the birth of a new nation—the Woodstock Nation. We're against the war. We honor freedom, music, and civil rights for all people. Come up here and be a part of Woodstock Nation."

The townsfolk put up some feeble resistance, but ultimately they are overwhelmed by the revolutionary *Zeitgeist*, as led by the Jewish avant garde. When the Local Losers and their wives tried "to form a human barricade against the tens of thousands of people travelling to the festival. . . . The hippies, young and old, just walked around and through the barricade, completely unfazed by the town council's demands." Not only were the local losers Nazis and anti-Semites, they showed up "dressed in plaid pants and candy-colored shirts." And as if that weren't bad enough "the women" showed up "in shirtwaist dresses." Tiber tries hard to restrain condescension and *schadenfreude* and fails: "It was, in all respects, a most pathetic and ineffective effort" because the locals "were simply too used to accepting the status quo

to launch an effective protest against anything. I might have laughed at them were it not for the fact that I found their efforts so terribly sad—and yes, even pitiful. With all the horrors taking place in the world, they had channeled their energy into stopping three days of music, peace and love."[33]

After their pathetic barricade was swept aside by the sea of hippies who had listened to Tiber on NBC and then docilely did what they were told, the local losers were forced to admit that Mike Lang was the Messiah. NBC had spread the Gospel. "Bathed in a river of light," Tiber "watched the cars and trucks come into town, people occasionally calling, 'Hey, El Monaco, we heard you on the radio!' More that one said, 'We got your message.'" Listening to the hippies, "Elation ran through me like healing waters. . . . I had never felt so much love—and redemption—in my entire life." Mike Lang had brought redemption. Or as Tiber put it: "When he showed up, all of Bethel came alive. I did too." Did our hearts not burn within us, when Mike Lang "open[ed] the closet door and let me loose in a wild party of sex, drugs and rock 'n' roll"?

When Tiber finally got to Max Yasgur's farm he discovered that it had become "the center of the universe" and when he "scanned the crowd," he "saw the gentle joy written on everyone's face" that Mike Lang had wrought. "These were the faces that had inspired him to name his generation Woodstock Nation. . . . The music and lyrics described a beautiful vision of freedom and peace, and the people who came to Woodstock became that vision."[34]

Of course, that "beautiful vision of freedom and peace" contained a few jarring notes, as when "The sound system was so powerful, in fact, that it cleared out every bird in Sullivan County. They didn't come back until after Woodstock was over," or when a good number of the citizens of Woodstock Nation were "trying to talk hippies down from any number of drug-induced nightmares," or when the "hundreds of people" laying "around the El Monaco grounds, stoned, drunk or snoozing" made the place look "like a battlefield after a long siege."

No matter. The Jewish Revolutionaries had brought *Tikkun Olam*, and Mike Lang was "was Moses leading the people to Bethel—which in Hebrew means House of God." There was even a Pentecost after Mike Lang's ascension in his helicopter, as "Choruses of voices arose from every direction in every language imaginable."[35]

Unfortunately when Mike Lang left, he did leave his disciples orphans, for, as Tiber put it, "In a few days, the Woodstock Ventures team would be gone. So would all my gay, lesbian and straight friends." After Mike Lang ascended in his helicopter for the last time, White Lake threatened "to go back to being bored and boring," and so after doing his best to wreck the town which appointed him president of its chamber of commerce, Tiber then abandoned it and decided to follow his dream of becoming a set designer in Hollywood.

So much for White Lake becoming the next Tanglewood! Tiber and his father "realized that there was nothing left for me in Bethel. I stuffed my

clothes and portfolio into my new car—a Cadillac, purchased with some of my Woodstock earnings—closed the trunk and said good-bye to Pop and Momma."[36]

Mrs. Teichberg left too. After cheating the locals and doing her best to ruin the reputation of the local hotel business, Tiber's "mother could now afford to go to Miami Beach in style, along with all the expatriated Catskill clientele."

Tiber was left to wrestle with the meaning of it all:

> I knew that for the first time, I was not alone. The years of hiding my sexuality, being chained to my parents by responsibility, and watching every dollar I made swallowed by a money pit had instilled a deep sense of isolation within me – a feeling of loneliness that never disappeared. But now I felt that I was part of a larger whole, a generation that could define itself by its embracing attitude, its crazy colorful styles, and its love of this new era of rock n roll.

In the end, the only consolation that Tiber can find is that, like Mike Lang, he is a revolutionary Jew, whose only satisfaction in life comes from spreading the virus of revolution and turning the *goyim* into unhappy Jewish homosexuals, i.e., people like himself: "I knew that wherever I went and whatever I did, I'd be taking Woodstock with me." Like a venereal disease that people like Tiber contracted in places like The Mine Shaft, Woodstock continues to spread, thanks to the Jewish revolutionaries who control our discourse and forge our chains in the name of liberation.

Chapter Six

Rabbinical Despotism

> I was well acquainted with the rabbinical despotism which by the power of superstition has established its throne for many centuries in Poland, and which for its own security sought in every possible way to prevent the spread of light and truth. I knew how closely the Jewish theocracy is connected with the national existence, so that the abolition of the former must inevitably bring with it the annihilation of the latter.
>
> Solomon Maimon,
> *The Autobiography of Solomon Maimon*[1]

The Coen brothers' film *A Serious Man* is set in Minneapolis in 1967, but it begins with a prologue in Yiddish, set in some *shtetl* in the Pale of the Settlement, which is to say in the part of Poland which Russia confiscated during the last decade of the 18th century. The exact date of the prologue is irrelevant because from the time that the Baal Shem Tov created Hasidism in the wake of the Shabbetai Zevi catastrophe and the Chmielnicki pogroms until the first writings of Moses Mendelssohn began to trickle into what Maimon referred to as "darkest Lithuania," time stood still in the Pale. Tevye lived his life in a world which Scholem Aleichem romanticized and which Solomon Maimon damned as the epitome of superstition, but it was a world which never changed, hence the lack of time cues in a movie otherwise obsessed with them.

A Serious Man is the Coen brothers' most autobiographical film to date from Hollywood's most successful siblings. Beginning with their collaboration with Sam Raimi's horror flick *The Undead* in the '80s, the Coen brothers have gone on to produce an oeuvre that is both commercially successful and generically diverse. Joel (born November 29, 1954) and Ethan (born September 21, 1957) Coen grew up in St. Louis Park, Minnesota, a suburb of Minneapolis/St. Paul. Both parents were professors. Edward Coen taught economics at the University of Minnesota and Rena Coen was an art historian at St. Cloud State University. Joel and Ethan, destined to be prodigies by nature and

nurture, amused themselves as children by making home movies on their Super 8 movie camera.

The Coens referred to *A Serious Man* as "a film . . . reminiscent of our childhoods." The synagogue where *A Serious Man* was filmed was "was close to where we grew up. . . . Marshak was a rabbi that we knew as kids. He was a sage. He said nothing but he had a lot of charisma." The kernel of the story was "the kid's stoned bar mitzvah," which was based on "characters that we knew." Given what they wanted to do, one of the first hurdles the Coens had to clear was "getting the Jewish community to cooperate." Once word of the stoned bar mitzvah got out, the people at the synagogue were worried.

"You not going to make fun of the Jews, are you?" one of the Coen brothers mimics, and then both brothers burst out laughing, as if the question were the punch line for a private joke. The big question about *A Serious Man* is: "Is it good for the Jews?" The question elicits more laughter from the Coens. Then as if some explanation is necessary one of the Coens adds, "It's not that we're laughing at anybody." And that statement elicits still more laughter. Then finally calming down, one of them adds with a straight face, "The congregants were very excited to be a part of the film."

To say that critics were perplexed by the film is an understatement. One reviewer described it as "gentle but dark." The Jewish reviewer for the *New York Post* seemed more conflicted than most. This is not surprising since *A Serious Man* is certainly the most anti-Jewish film Hollywood has ever produced. It makes *Jud Suess* look like *Fiddler on the Roof* by comparison. The Jewish thought police raked Steven Spielberg over the coals for directing *Munich*, but *Munich* comes across as an Israeli propaganda film in comparison to the Coens' *A Serious Man*.

The film makes a number of statements, all of them anti-Jewish:

1. the Jewish religion is a false religion which can offer not only no consolation for suffering, but no explanation for the most important events in a man's life, in particular, the presence of evil.

2. all rabbis are clueless, fatuous fools.

3. all Jews are repulsive. The film goes out of its way to make Jews—from Larry's brother Arthur, who spends the entire film draining his sebaceous cyst, to Larry's family, which engages in high-decibel soup slurping with a Menorah in the background—seem as physically unattractive as possible.

4. a catastrophe is looming on the horizon.

A Serious Man is, beyond all that, a tale of rabbicide. If you read the trailing credits long enough, you will learn that "no Jew was killed in the making of this film." That's because, in this story, the rabbis discredit themselves so much that the killing remains a mere formality. But the question raised during the Yiddish prologue remains: If we kill the rabbi, will we be cursed? Or as Maimon puts it: Will the abolition of the despotic Jewish theocracy mean the annihilation of the Jewish nation? Or will it mean its liberation? Or have the

Jews been cursed since they killed another rabbi and cried out in unison, "His blood be on us and on our children!"

These are questions more suitable for the Coen brothers than Larry Gopnik, the protagonist of *A Serious Man*. In a supplement to the DVD, the Coen brothers explained that they were looking for a suitable Yiddish tale to begin their movie. Unable to find one, they decided to make one up. The Yiddish prologue to *A Serious Man* is, as a result, both personal and archetypal. A Jew enters the hovel where he lives with his wife and tells her that a wheel fell off his cart on the way home. Fortunately, even though the hour was late and the road deserted, a famous rabbi happened by and helped him. Full of gratitude, the Jew invited the rabbi to his house for a bowl of soup.

Expecting a sympathetic response from his wife, the Jew is shocked when she tells him that the rabbi in question died three years earlier and that he has been talking to a *dybbuk*—in Jewish folklore, the wandering soul of a dead person who has taken up residence in the body of a living person. In the middle of their heated discussion, both husband and wife freeze when they hear a knock at the door. The rabbi enters and sits down by the fire, only to have the wife confront him. When words fail to get the rabbi to confess his true identity, the wife stabs him with an ice pick. The rabbi laughs after being stabbed as if to prove the wife right. He is a *dybbuk*. But then, blood begins to discolor his shirt where the ice pick has been rammed into his chest, and he asks, "Is this the way you repay kindness?"

Is the rabbi a kindly old man who deserves not only hospitality but respect and gratitude? Or is it a *dybbuk*, which is to say, an evil spirit, sent to oppress them? The Coen brothers made up the story, but Solomon Maimon, refugee from the *shtetl* and devotee of the Enlightenment, articulated the terms of engagement two centuries earlier when he wondered if rabbinic despotism was the only thing which kept the Jewish race together. If so, the Coen brothers have a dilemma. If the rabbi is a tyrant, he deserves to be killed, but if the Jew's wife kills the rabbi, then his entire family will be cursed. This is clearly the Jewish version of a no-win situation. The wife never wavers in her belief that she has dispatched a *dybbuk*, but the husband is wracked with doubt. "We're cursed," he says when the rabbi gets up to leave and walks off into the blizzard raging outside their hovel.

Cut to a suburb of Minneapolis during the summer of 1967. The narrative now bounces back and forth between Larry Gopnik, a physics professor at what looks like the local branch of the state university, and Danny, his 12-year-old son. Larry is at his doctor's office undergoing what looks like a routine physical exam, and Danny is studying Hebrew and about to be bar mitzvahed in two weeks. Before long, it's pretty clear that Danny, along with everyone else in his class, hates Hebrew school. In order to overcome the boredom associated with talmudic study, Danny listens to Jefferson Airplane and smokes dope. This aversion to the Talmud is nothing new. Solomon Maimon

hated Hebrew school too, characterizing "the subjects of the Talmud" as "dry and mostly unintelligible to a child." The shul wasn't much better than its curriculum. Jewish children from the Pale were "imprisoned from morning till night" in "a small smoky hut," where "the children are scattered, some on benches, some on the bare earth."[2] Then as now, when "children are doomed in the bloom of youth to such an infernal school, it may be easily imagined with what joy and rapture they look forward to their release."[3]

According to Heinrich Graetz, the father of Jewish historiography, the net result of immersion in Talmudic studies was the moral corruption of the Jews who studied it:

> A love of twisting, distorting, ingenious quibbling, and a foregone antipathy to what did not lie within their field of vision, constituted the character of the Polish Jews. Pride in their knowledge of the Talmud and a spirit of dogmatism attached even to the best rabbis, and undermined their moral sense. The Polish Jews of course were extraordinarily pious but even their piety rested on sophistry and boastfulness. . . . The vulgar acquired the quibbling method of the schools and employed it to outwit the less cunning. They found pleasure and a sort of triumphant delight in deception and cheating.[4]

Between the beginning of the film and the bar mitzvah, Danny whiles away his time in Hebrew class listening to Jefferson Airplane through the earplug of his transistor radio and trying pass a $20 bill to classmate Fagel for the marijuana he has bought from him. Sensing something amiss, the rabbi pulls out Danny's earplug, the room is filled with "Somebody to Love," and the class explodes into the music-driven anarchy of the '60s. The students at the local Hebrew school have made a discovery: "when the truth is found to be lies . . . all the joy within you dies." When intellectual props have been kicked out from underneath the rabbinic enterprise, all that's left is recourse to sensual pleasure—sex, drugs, and rock n' roll.

Danny's father, Larry Gopnik, discovers the same thing in a much more painful fashion. Larry Gopnik is a Jewish physics professor, but he is also a modern-day Job in a world which has replaced suffering with banality. Gopnik teaches at an unnamed university in the Midwest and—awaiting the results of a medical examination, as well as the decision over whether he gets tenure, and his son's bar mitzvah—his world suddenly falls apart. When Gopnik arrives home in his Dodge Coronet to a meticulously barren recreation of a '60s suburb, things go seriously wrong. His wife announces that she has been having an affair with Gopnik's colleague, the much older Sy Abelman, and that she wants a divorce. As if this weren't bad enough, she adds religious insult to marital injury by demanding a *get*, which is to say the Talmudic ratification of divorce so that she can remain an upstanding member of the local Jewish community. To spare their two obnoxious children any psychic

conflict, the wife demands that Gopnik and his brother, who spends most of the movie in the Gopniks' one bathroom draining a sebaceous cyst, move out of the Gopnik house into the Jolly Roger motel. Gopnik, the quintessential schlemiel, is dumbfounded, and, when he tries to get his bearings, his wife tells him to see their rabbi. "I have begged you to see the rabbi," says Larry's wife, and this becomes the theological refrain which runs throughout the entire movie.

Like Job, Larry Gopnik goes from one counselor to another, and they all tell him the same thing. Watching his awkward and physically repulsive older brother flounder around in one of Minnesota's many lakes, Larry listens to a Jewish woman wearing leg braces explain that "it's not always easy to decipher what *Ha Shem* [i.e., God] is telling us." No one, it would seem, should be better prepared to deal with adversity than the Jews. "We're Jews," the lady with the leg braces tells Larry, "we have thousands of years of tradition to draw on—all the stories of people who have had the same problems." Virtually every encounter in the film ends with the same bit of advice: "Talk to the rabbi," the crippled lady tells Larry.

That admonition sets up the plot framework for a deeply theological film, whose plot revolves around Gopnik's visit to three different rabbis. Larry Gopnik is Job, but he is living at a time when the Jewish religion under whose dispensation the Book of Job was written, is dead and obsolete. The rabbis who represent this religion, as a result, are incapable of explaining anything. Hoping to meet with the senior rabbi, Gopnik enounters instead his junior colleague, Rabbi Scott, who upbraids Larry for lacking "capacity for wonder" and the "right perspective." Jumping up from behind his desk, Rabbi Scott goes to the window of his study and, pulling back the curtain, gives Larry the key to understanding all of his problems: "Look at the parking lot, Larry!" Larry's problem, according to Rabbi Scott, is that "You're looking at your wife with old eyes." When Larry informs that rabbi that his problem is that his wife is sleeping with Sy Abelman, the rabbi is at a loss for words. "Oh, sorry," he blurts out. Instead of supporting Larry as a victim of adultery, the rabbi tacitly condones it by showing himself willing to help the wife get her *get*. After collaborating in the destruction of Larry's marriage, the rabbi gets back to the vision thing by telling him, "This is life. This is an expression of God's will. Things aren't so bad. Look at the parking lot, Larry."

The encounter with the second rabbi is more intellectually frustrating and more spiritually bankrupt than the first encounter. Rabbi Nachner, the man with the "life experience" Rabbi Scott lacked, listens patiently dunking a tea bag as Larry explains that "the carpet has been yanked out from under me." Since his meeting with the junior rabbi, Sy Abelman has died in a car accident, but now somehow everyone is expecting Larry to pay for the funeral of the man that cuckolded him. Somehow this doesn't seem fair.

"Somebody has to pay for Sy's funeral, but why is it me? I'm so strapped for money now. I don't know. What does it all mean? Paying for Sy's funeral? He died the same instant I had the crash. Does that mean that I am Sy Abelman. Does it mean that we are all one? How does God speak to us?"

Rabbi Nachner responds by telling Larry the story of the *goy*'s teeth. A dentist in the rabbi's congregation by the name of Sussman, while making an appliance for one of his *goy* patients, noticed Hebrew writing on the inside of the *goy*'s lower incisors, writing which when deciphered, said "Help me! Save me!"

"This in a *goy*'s mouth, Larry!"

Needless to say, Sussman was stunned: "Sussman can't eat. Sussman can't sleep. He examines the mouths of his patients, Jew and *goy* alike" and wants to know what this could mean. Sussman, who is an educated man ("Not like Rabbi Marshak but an educated man. He knows about the Zohar.") asks the rabbi if the answer lies in Kaballah. Sussman knows that every Hebrew letter has a numerical equivalent. Transposing the Hebrew letters to numbers, he comes up with the telephone number of the Red Owl Supermarket in Bloomington, Minnesota. He calls the number and asks the manager if he knows a *goy* with Hebrew writing on his teeth. Getting no satisfactory answer he goes to the Red Owl Supermarket, but finds nothing. Returning to Rabbi Nachner, Sussman asks, "What does it mean? Is the answer in Kaballah or Torah? What can such a sign mean?"

Intrigued by the story, Larry asks, "What did you tell him?"

"Teeth?" answers Rabbi Nachner. "Don't know. God? Don't know. Helping others? Can't hurt."

To which Larry responds: "It sounds like you don't know anything."

The story ends with a picture of Sussman playing golf and Nachner adding, "He stopped asking. He returned to life." The moral of the story, according to Rabbi Nachner, is that "questions are like a tooth ache," but Larry isn't satisfied with this response. "I want an answer," he objects, but according to the rabbi, "Ha Shem doesn't owe you an answer." And even if Ha Shem had the answer, the rabbi continues, "He hasn't told me." Subdued by the thought that nothing has any meaning, Larry asks one more question: "What happened to the *goy*?"

"The *goy*?" Nachner answers. "Who cares?"

Solomon Maimon's autobiography caused a sensation when it appeared in Berlin at the end of the 18th century. Like the Coen brothers, Maimon felt that Judaism was a false religion and that the rabbis were the enemy of the Jewish people. The Kaballah, as Nachner's exposition of the *goy*'s teeth made clear, could be used to justify anything, including the claim that nothing had any justification: "The remotest analogies between signs and things were seized, till at last the Kaballah degenerated into an art of madness according to method, or a systematic science resting on fancy."

Brother Nathanael Kapner, who was born in 1950 and is four years older that Joel Coen, felt the same way about the Jewish religion he was raised in. Like Danny Gopnik in *A Serious Man*, Kapner went to Hebrew school. Unlike Danny he didn't get stoned or listen to Jefferson Airplane. Kapner was a pious Jewish boy, something which makes the epiphany he had in a Pittsburgh synagogue, all the more startling:

> I recall my parents taking me to my cousin's Bar Mitzvah at a farther part of the City of Pittsburgh, where I grew up. We entered into an old, musty smelling synagogue which had the Jewish Star of David everywhere. After only 10 minutes of being inside, I got very nauseated and wanted to vomit. The synagogue seemed to have a deathly pall about it. And I couldn't bear looking at the Jewish Star everywhere. I learned later that the Star of David is an occult symbol that was popularized by the Kabbalists of the 13th Century in Europe. It was then at the age of 8, through my experience in that old, musty smelling synagogue, that I knew that Judaism was a religion of death.

Kapner was exposed to Christianity as a child, but the rabbis kept him from acting on what he saw:

> The neighborhood where I grew up was made up of Jews, Catholics, and Protestants. Every year at Christmas time in the 1950s, all of our Gentile neighbors put up the Nativity Scene on their lawns. I simply loved looking at the Nativity Scene! And I wanted to know more about Jesus Christ. But we were forbidden to even mention Jesus Christ's name unless we used it as a curse word.
>
> A boyhood friend of mine named Ricky Rago was a Roman Catholic. One afternoon after playing baseball, Ricky Rago invited me over to his house and we went into his bedroom to play Monopoly.
>
> All over his walls were pictures of the *12 Stations Of The Cross*. I was 10 years old at the time and these pictures of Christ's sufferings made a deep impression on me. I promised myself that one day I would learn the meaning of these sufferings of Jesus Christ.

Hebrew school, in Kapner's experience, wasn't so much an introduction to the Torah, as it was an inoculation against Christianity. As part of his Hebrew school curriculum, Kapner was required to take a course in Comparative Religion, in which he and his classmates studied Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam. After that build up, Kapner was shocked to hear his teacher announce that they were not going to study Christianity. "You see children," Mrs. Schechter, his teacher said,

> Christianity was made up by a manic-depressant by the name of Saul of Tarsus who wanted to blame the crucifixion of a criminal named Jesus

> Christ on the Jewish people. And Saul of Tarsus you should know was a "self-hating" Jew. He hated being a Jew so much that he even changed his name to "Paul!"
>
> Now it happened dear children that 500 years after Jesus Christ was crucified, the Roman Catholic Church took the crazed writings of Saul of Tarsus and made a religion out of it. They called this religion, "Christianity." Thus we are not going to bother studying this false and hate-mongering religion.

Kapner's father, unsurprisingly, reiterated what Kapner had learned in the synagogue:

> When I got home I asked my father what he thought about Saul of Tarsus. My father answered, "Saul of Tarsus tried to convince Jews to become Christians. But we are born Jews and we should die as Jews."

Solomon Maimon noticed something similar in the attitude of the rabbis of his day: "As I observed in most of the rabbis a good deal of pride, quarrelsomeness and other evil qualities, they became objects of dislike to me on that account."[3] Confronted with what seemed like an insuperable conflict between faith and reason, Maimon vowed to leave Poland, along with his wife and family, and move to Berlin, where he could "destroy by enlightenment the remnant of superstition which still clung to me." This decision set Maimon permanently at odds with the Jewish people, rendering him by and large unemployable as a tutor "because the parents of these young people were anxious lest their children should be led astray and by independent thinking on religion, be made to waver in their faith. . . . They could not rely up on their children having sufficient judgment to be able to enter upon this course without passing from one extreme to the other, from superstition to unbelief, and perhaps they were right."

Maimon's behavior didn't help matters any. Like the Coen brothers, he went out of his way to outrage Jewish sensibilities. While in Posen, Maimon deliberately touched what the Jews felt was a sacred stag horn at the entrance to the synagogue: "Horror-struck they expected my death on the spot, but as nothing happened their anxiety for me was converted into hatred. They looked on me as one who had profaned the sanctuary." Spurred on by his hatred of "the spirit of fanaticism" he found among the rabbis, Maimon "began to push matters a little further, frequently slept through the time of prayer, went seldom to the synagogue and so on" until he brought on the persecution that he had warned against. The Jews deprived of a rational religion, had no way to incorporate Maimon's critique into their practice, and so Maimon, like his predecessor Spinoza, was expelled from the synagogue.

Solomon Maimon was an advocate of the Enlightenment. He suggested that the study of mathematics and science would break the hold of the superstitious

rabbis and bring Enlightenment to the Jewish people, but things turned out differently. Larry Gopnik is a product of the Enlightenment. He is well-versed in mathematics and physics, but physics isn't what it was when the Maskilim in Berlin were in awe of Sir Isaac Newton and his marvelous system. Physics, as Gopnik teaches it, is Heissenberg's uncertainty principle. In one of the film's many dream sequences, Larry is dwarfed by a huge blackboard covered with incomprehensible equations. Explaining Heissenberg's uncertainty principle to his students, Gopnik sums up everything by saying "it proves that we can't really know what's going on, but you'll be responsible for it on the midterm."

Unlike Larry Gopnik, the successful brother who makes a living teaching a theory in physics which doesn't explain anything, Arthur, his older brother, is a loser in everyone's estimation. He sleeps on the couch in the Gopnik's living room. He spends most of his day draining the cyst on his neck, but unlike his brother, Arthur has come up with a system that actually works. The cabbalistic "Mentaculus," is "a probability map of the universe," which allows him to win money at cards: ("Some *goys* put together a private game. I think they're Italian.") even if it can't keep him from soliciting at the town's notorious gay bar and getting him arrested for sodomy. "What's sodomy, dad?" Larry's son asks, when the police show up at the Gopnik's front door with Arthur in handcuffs.

When Larry consults a lawyer about his brother's arrest, the lawyer asks him the same question: "Have you talked to the rabbi?"

Larry: "I talked to Nachner."

Lawyer: "Did he tell you the story about the *goy*'s teeth? Go talk to Marshak. He's a wise man."

Before long, Larry is dreaming about people telling him to talk to the rabbi. In one dream sequence, the late Sy Abelman, still wearing the golfing outfit he died in, engages Larry in a debate over mathematics which ends with Sy banging Larry's head against the black board while screaming over and over "I f**ked your wife. See Marshak."

Taking the advice of both the living and the dead, Larry finally goes to see Rabbi Marshak. "I need help," Larry tells Marshak's secretary. "I have a lot of *Tsuris* [troubles] in my life. This is not a frivolous request. Tell him I need help." The secretary opens the door and walks into Rabbi's study. Rabbi Marshak is sitting behind desk as she explains Larry's request. She returns and tells Larry, "the rabbi is busy."

"He doesn't look busy," Larry responds shrilly.

Secretary: "He's thinking."

The rabbis are not only useless when it comes to explaining the presence of evil in the world or giving advice, their rituals don't help either. Danny's bar mitzvah is the highpoint of the film; with Sy Abelman dead, it looks as if Larry and his wife are going to get back together. As they sit in the synagogue waiting for Danny to go up and sing the Torah, Larry's wife tells him that "Sy

admired you so much. He wrote letters to the tenure committee." The look on Larry's face indicates just how he feels about his wife bringing up the now-dead Sy at a moment like this; as well as the realization that he now knows who was writing all of those anonymous letters about his moral turpitude to the tenure committee. Our sense that Larry is finally out of the woods is undermined further because Danny has to get stoned to go through with the ceremony. After a few tense moments, when it looks as if Danny might pass out in front of everyone, he finally finds his voice, sings the Torah, and, after it is all over, Rabbi Nachner greets Larry's totally stoned son as "a member of our tribe."

As a reward for his performance at the bar mitzvah, Danny, still stoned, gets to meet Rabbi Marshak, the man who refused to discuss his father's troubles because Marshak was busy "thinking." After a long walk through Marshak's cluttered study, Danny sits at the rabbi's feet, and after almost an entire film of anticipation, the senior rabbi finally opens his mouth and says: "When the truth is found to be lies/And all the joy within you dies. Denn wot?" Without waiting for an answer, the wise old rabbi continues by naming the members of the Jefferson Airplane. "It was wonderful," he says of the song he has been listening to for the past two weeks and hands Danny back the transistor radio with the $20 bill in the case which his teacher confiscated from Hebrew class.

Cut to Danny listening to Jefferson Airplane in Hebrew class once more. This time, however, the Rabbi is interrupted by the school secretary, who tells him that a tornado is approaching. The Rabbi then tells the children that they all need to take shelter in the synagogue basement.

After getting arrested for sodomy, Arthur has reached the end of his rope. He runs out of their motel room screaming. Larry finds him sitting beside the motel's empty swimming pool sobbing: "Ha Shem hasn't given me shit." In the most moving scene in the movie, Larry embraces his brother Arthur, and tries to offer him the consolation that has been denied him by the three rabbis.

"It'll be okay," Larry tells his brother. "We'll get Ron Meshbesher to take your case." Ron Meshbesher is the third lawyer Larry has had to consult. (Solomon Schlutz, the senior partner in the firm handling Larry's divorce, keeled over with a heart attack before he could give Larry any advice in the real estate battle Larry was having with his *goy* neighbor, the one who takes his son hunting when the boy should be in school.) Since Ron Meschbescher is a criminal lawyer, he requires a retainer of $3,000 up front. Three thousand dollars is precisely the amount of money that a Korean student passed to Larry in attempt to bribe him to change his failing grade. Larry looks at the retainer agreement from Ron Meshbesher. He then looks at his grade sheet. He then looks at the envelope from the Korean student containing the $3,00 bribe. With the rain from the thunderstorm which has spawned the tornado

now approaching his son's school pelting his window, Larry takes out a pencil and erases the F next to Mr. Park, the Korean student's name, and puts a C- in its place.

No sooner is the deed done than the phone on Larry's desk rings. It's the physician who gave him a clean bill of health at the beginning of the film. Something has showed up on the X-ray. Could Larry come in to discuss the results.

"Can't we discuss them over the phone?" Larry wants to know.

"No, in person would be better."

"When," Larry asks.

"Now," says the doctor. "Now would be good. I've cleared a place in my schedule."

Meanwhile, the Hebrew students have gathered in the schoolyard, where they are being battered by the storm. Outside the schoolyard, one of his classmates tells Danny that "The wind is going to rip that fucking flag off the flag pole." The storm seems to symbolize the sexual revolution of the '60s, the revolution which New Left Red Diaper babies like David Horowitz created to punish the United States for treating their Stalinist parents so badly. Horowitz's participation in the sexual revolution—in particular, his affair with Abby Rockefeller—destroyed his marriage and almost destroyed his life when he took to driving the sports car he bought as compensation for the break up of his marriage at unsafe speeds. He then converted from New Leftism to Neoconservatism but never stopped being a Jewish revolutionary, and his revolutionary activity never stopped being harmful to American culture.

When it comes to the Jews, America is doomed one way or another. Suburbia, to get back to the film, is a creation of Jews like the Levitts, who gave us Levittown, the suburb that set the pattern of banality for the rest of the country for the post-World War II era. The Levitts came up with the mass produced slab house that the Coen brothers found so insufferable growing up. As in the Pale of the Settlement where the Jewish descendents of Solomon Maimon blamed the Czar for the tyranny of the rabbis, so in America, where the next generation of Gopniks found the world their fathers created intolerable, and instead of killing their own rabbis, they kill the culture which harbored them instead. Like David Horowitz, they always run the danger of perishing in the conflagration they themselves started. That seems to be the meaning of the tornado at the end of the film.

Outside the synagogue, the rabbi is struggling unsuccessfully to find the key to open the door to the synagogue basement so that he can lead his charges to safety. Danny Gopnik calls to Fagel the drug dealer as if to pay him back the $20 he owes him, but his gaze is drawn instead to the tornado bearing down on all of them, about to destroy them. The Jews, the Coen brothers seem to be telling us, are facing some sort of catastrophe: either the sexual revolution

of the '60s which wiped out a significant portion of the baby boomer Jews, bringing about the demographic crisis to which Alan Dershowitz among others has alluded or the tornado symbolizes some catastrophe looming for the Jews. After the neocon Jews pushed America into a disastrous war with Iraq which led to a mountain of unrepayable debt, Jews like Mr. Lloyd Blankfein of Goldman Sachs and Mr. Rubenstein of the Carlyle group (not to mention Alan Greenspan, Ben Shalom Bernanke, Larry Summers and Robert Rubin) presided over the looting of the American economy, piling more unrepayable debt onto the backs of the American people. Then, as if that weren't enough, the first group of Jews demanded that President Obama attack Iran.

Around the time that the DVD of *A Serious Man* was released, neocon warmonger Daniel Pipes was writing an article on *National Review Online* entitled, "How to Save the Obama Presidency: Bomb Iran." And what was the Catholic reaction to this effrontery? William Donohue, head of the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights, wrote an editorial calling for economic sanctions against Iran.

Then, just to show that great minds run in the same circles, on the same day, Deal Hudson, editor of the now defunct *Crisis* magazine, wrote an editorial calling for the same thing. Now how is it that these great Catholic minds came to the same conclusion on the same day on an issue of no concern to Catholics? If you're really stumped, I recommend a short review of the political career of former Pennsylvania Senator Rick Santorum. Santorum, who used Jewish money to buy Catholic votes, and never did anything in return for the Catholics who elected him to office. Santorum ended his career in the Senate by campaigning for war with Iran. According to the late Tom Herron, Santorum's Iran-speech was both his political swan song and a job application. Then, lo and behold, where does former Senator Rick Santorum pop up after losing the election? At the American Enterprise Institute, where Jewish financiers like private equity king David Rubenstein pay his salary directly.

The scene of the rabbi struggling to find the right key to open the door to the synagogue basement is the second time that obliquely Christian themes made their appearance in *A Serious Man*. (The first came when Larry's daughter, hearing her uncle say for the nth time, "Just a minute," from the other side of the bathroom door, exclaimed "Jesus Christ.") Sooner or later, confronted by the fact that the rabbis do not have the keys of the kingdom and are blocking the door to salvation by refusing to go in themselves and preventing others from going in as well, the Jew considers becoming a Christian. After being spurned by both the rabbis and Enlightened Jews like Moses Mendelssohn, Solomon Maimon had reached the end of his rope and concluded that "there was no alternative left but to embrace the Christian religion and get myself baptized in Hamburg."[6]

Unlike Nicholas Donin and Josef Pfefferkorn and Eugenio Zolli, the chief Rabbi of Rome who converted because of the heroic witness of Pope Piux XII during World War II, and Nathanael Kapner, Solomon Maimon never made it into the Church which is the ark of salvation. "I am a native of Poland," he told a Lutheran minister in Hamburg,

> belonging to the Jewish nation, destined by my education and studies to be a rabbi; but in the thickest darkness, I have perceived some light. This has induced me to search further after light and truth and to free myself completely from the darkness of superstition and ignorance. As this could not be attained in my native place, I went to Berlin, where with the support of some enlightened men of our nation I studied for some years—not indeed with any plan but merely to satisfy my thirst for knowledge. But as our nation is unable to use, not only such planless studies, but even those based on the most perfect plan, it cannot be blamed for becoming tired of them, and pronouncing their encouragement to be useless. I have therefore resolved, in order to secure temporal as well as eternal happiness, which depends on the attainment of perfection, and in order to become useful to myself as well as others, to embrace the Christian religion.

True to the vision of the man who founded their sect, the Lutherans never had a clear understanding of the relationship between faith and reason, and so passages like following were bound to cause problems:

> The Jewish religion, it is true, comes, in its articles of faith, nearer to reason than Christianity. But in practical use the latter has an advantage over the former; and since morality, which consists not in opinions but in actions, is the aim of all religion, clearly the latter comes nearer than the former to this aim. Moreover, I esteem the mysteries of the Christian religion for that which they are, that is allegorical representations of the truths that are most important to man. Thus I make my faith in them harmonize with reason, but I cannot believe them literally. I beg therefore most respectfully an answer to the question, whether after this confession I am worthy of the Christian religion or not. If I am, I am prepared to carry my proposal into effect; but if not, I must give up all claim to a religion which enjoins me to lie, that is, to deliver a confession of faith which contradicts my reason.[7]

If the Lutheran pastor was handicapped by the exaggeration of faith bequeathed to him by Luther, Maimon was equally handicapped by the truncated form of reason he derived from the Enlightenment. As a result, Maimon's conversion to Christianity never happened. In addition to impugning Maimon's motives ("your intention is to embrace the Christian religion merely in order to improve your temporal circumstances?") the Lutheran pastor misunderstood the relationship between faith and reason, claiming that Maimon was "too

much of a philosopher to be able to become a Christian. Reason has taken the upper hand with you, and faith must accommodate itself to reason."[8]

As a result of this rebuff, Maimon concluded that "I must therefore remain what I am—a stiff-necked Jew. My religion enjoins me to believe nothing, but to think the truth and practice goodness. . . . With this I bade the pastor goodbye."

Ultimately, Maimon fared no better with the Enlightened Jews of Berlin because, as he put it,

> The Jewish nation is, apart from accidental modifications, a perpetual aristocracy under the guise of a theocracy. The learned men, who form the nobility in the nation, have been able, for many centuries, to maintain their position as the legislative body with so much authority among the common people, that they can do with them whatever they please.[9]

Like Solomon Maimon, Nathanael Kapner had to leave home to escape from the rabbis' power over him. In Kapner's case, it wasn't to Berlin that he fled, as Maimon had in the 1780s; it was to Los Angeles, where he began his undergraduate studies in 1968:

> I finally left my home and synagogue to go to college in Los Angeles in 1968. But I forgot about my promise. It wasn't until 1970 that one of the Jesus Freaks, who were very popular at that time, gave me a New Testament. I opened it up and started reading the *Gospel of St. Matthew.* I was struck by the "Jewishness" of the writing.
>
> And I soon found myself captivated by the person of Jesus Christ! He was a man who rubbed shoulders with the common people. He was a man who taught the people from every-day life experiences. And what I liked most of all about Him was when He said to the religious leaders, "The harlots and tax collectors go into the kingdom of heaven before you." I could almost see Him saying this to Mrs. Schecter, who called Him a "criminal." I simply found myself falling in love with Jesus Christ! I devoured the entire New Testament from cover to cover and could not put it down. I did read about the sufferings of Jesus Christ, and it made me cry. And I did read the 'crazed writings' of St Paul and knew that there was nothing 'crazed' about it at all—but were words of hope and purpose. I said to myself, "Judaism is bankrupt. But the Christian message is full of promise and life."
>
> When I finished the last Chapter of the Book of Revelations, now at the age of 21, I got down on my knees, wept, and asked Jesus Christ to forgive all my sins and be my Saviour.
>
> Soon afterward I met an old pious woman at a Church gathering who came up to me and said, "God has so much for you and so much for

> you to do." Like a cryptic oracle, long awaiting its coming, I am just beginning, 37 years later, to see this prophecy come true.

As the author of *Fides et Ratio* and the heir of the Apostles, Joseph Ratzinger, both as bishop and pope, would seem to have an advantage over the poor Lutheran pastor who turned Solomon Maimon away, and yet if not hampered by a defective understanding of the relationship between faith and reason, the pope seems equally hampered by a desire to engage in dialogue with the rabbis, whom virtually all Jewish converts see as oppressors of the Jewish people. In his visit to the synagogue of Rome in January 2010, the pope cited Vatican II as the theological justification for his visit, claiming that

> The teaching of the Second Vatican Council has represented for Catholics a clear landmark to which constant reference is made in our attitude and our relations with the Jewish people, marking a new and significant stage. The Council gave a strong impetus to our irrevocable commitment to pursue the path of dialogue, fraternity and friendship, a journey which has been deepened and developed in the last forty years, through important steps and significant gestures.

As we have come to expect from meetings like this, what he said may have seemed supine and groveling to Catholics, but it was never enough to placate or mollify the stiff-necked rabbis, who continued to harp on Pope Pius XII, expecting—if not demanding—that Pope Benedict denounce him as a war criminal. The pope went on to add that, "I too, in the course of my Pontificate, have wanted to demonstrate my closeness to and my affection for the people of the Covenant." But that overture met with an equally cold response. By now it should be obvious that trying to placate rabbis is a hopeless task. But worse than that, in his efforts to placate the rabbis, the pope turned his back on the Nathanael Kapners, and Solomon Maimons, and—who knows?—Jews like the Coen Brothers, who see the rabbis as the oppressors of the Jewish people. Progress in Catholic-Jewish dialogue is another word for suppression of the truth. Dialogue with the rabbis means collaboration with the forces who are determined to keep Jews ignorant of Christ.

In his meeting with the rabbis at the synagogue in Rome, the pope attempted to find common ground in the Ten Commandments, because

> The "Ten Commandments" call us to preserve and to promote the sanctity of the family, in which the personal and reciprocal, faithful and definitive "Yes" of man and woman makes room for the future, for the authentic humanity of each, and makes them open, at the same time, to the gift of new life. To witness that the family continues to be the essential cell of society and the basic environment in which human virtues are learned and practiced is a precious service offered in the construction of a world with a more human face.

The sentiments are noble, but the pope's statement ignored the role which the rabbis have played in promoting divorce, both at the time of Christ and in 2010, and in the intervening period as well. Like Larry Gopnik's wife, Solomon Maimon's wife wanted a divorce, and both Mrs. Gopnik and Mrs. Maimon discovered that the best place to go for assistance in getting one is to the rabbis. Maimon was reluctant to grant the divorce, but, as he puts it, "my wife went with my son to consult some orthodox Jews, whose advice she thought she could trust and they recommended her to press at once for a divorce, and on no account to let my son remain with me."

So much for rabbis supporting "the sanctity of the family." When Maimon refused to go through with the divorce, "the presiding judge became furious, began to call me names, pronounced me a damnable heretic, and cursed me in the name of the Lord."[10]

Before this travesty continues any further, the pope should sit down with his advisers and analyze the possible outcomes of any future visits to synagogues and, along with that, the future of Catholic-Jewish dialogue in general. As Woody Hayes used to say, three things can happen when you pass the ball, and two of them are bad. The odds involving the successful outcome of Catholic-Jewish dialogue are about the same. Pope Benedict indicated his concern for the Jewish people. If that is the case, why did he insist on speaking exclusively to rabbis? In what sense do they represent the interests of the Jewish people? If the testimony of Solomon Maimon, Nathanael Kapner, and the Coen brothers means anything, the rabbis are the oppressors of the Jewish people, not representatives of their interests. By entering into dialogue with the rabbis, the pope turned his back on Jews like Brother Nathanael Kaplan. No less an authority than Abe Foxman, head of the ADL, informed the American bishops, after their repudiation of the Keeler Statement, that dialogue and conversion were mutually exclusive alternatives.

It's difficult to disagree with Foxman. But if that's the case, which path is the Church going to choose? If she continues down the path of dialogue, she will willy nilly deny the Gospel by refusing to preach it to Jews like Larry Gopnik because giving up the conversion option is the *conditio sine qua non* of dialogue. If a pope chooses both dialogue with the rabbis and proselytism with the less important Jews, he runs the risk of being seen as a hypocrite. The Church cannot deny the Gospel, and she cannot tolerate double standards. The only viable option is the option exercised by the first pope, St. Peter, who told the Jews in Jerusalem, "Jesus the Nazarene was a man commended to you by God. . . . You killed him, but God raised him to life." "Cut to the heart by what Peter said, the Jews asked Peter and the Apostles, "what must we do, brothers?" To which, Peter replied, "You must repent, and every one of you must be baptized."

Catholic-Jewish dialogue has become an empty ritual disconnected from both the reality which the Jewish people are forced to live under their despotic

rabbis and the reality of the Catholic Faith. It has become an idol, the worship of which is forbidden by the first commandment. Dialogue is another religion, one that undermines the clear testimony of the Gospel and delivers the great majority of the Jewish people into the hands of their oppressors. Adding insult to injury, Pope Benedict claimed that one of the fruits of Catholic-Jewish dialogue was "a renewed respect for the Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament." *A Serious Man* is a work of fiction, but fiction in order to be compelling has to tell the truth. And the truth it told about the rabbis is that the Jewish interpretation of the Old Testament is conspicuous by its absence when it comes to counseling the Larry Gopniks of this world. Larry could have profited by reading the Book of Job, but none of the rabbis felt it was relevant to his situation. If they had, they would have mentioned it. In this regard, the Second Vatican Council's decree on the means of social communication, *Inter Mirifica*, might provide a helpful complement to *Nostra Aetate*, the Vatican II document on the Jews. The Church should take to heart the Council's praise of "new avenues of easy communication of all kinds of news, of ideas, and orientations." *Inter Mirifica* goes on to claim that the cinema, "if . . . properly used . . . can be of considerable benefit to mankind."

So, the next time, a pope feels tempted to submit himself and the Church he represents to more abuse from the rabbis by visiting another synagogue, he should think twice. Rather than inflict more damage on the Larry Gopniks of the world, he should give Walter Cardinal Kasper a call, and the two of them should watch *A Serious Man* instead.

Chapter Seven

The End of Dialogue and the Beginning of Unity

"Every kingdom divided against itself is heading for ruin, and a household divided against itself collapses."

– Luke 11:17

"Heretics, Jews and Heathens have made a unity against Unity."

– St. Augustine, Sermons

In an article which appeared just before Christmas, 2009, David D. Kirkpatrick of the *New York Times* anointed Princeton Professor Robert P. George as "this country's most influential conservative thinker."[1] The proximate reason for the anointing was a manifesto known as The Manhattan Declaration, which George launched in September in the library of the Metropolitan Club. According to Kirkpatrick, George in collaboration with "conservative evangelicals like the born-again Watergate felon Chuck Colson," Metropolitan Jonah, the primate of the Orthodox Church in America, and "more than half a dozen of this country's most influential Roman Catholic bishops, including Archbishop Timothy Dolan of New York, Archbishop John Myers of Newark, and Cardinal Justin Rigali of Philadelphia . . . drafted a 4,700 word manifesto that promised resistance to the point of civil disobedience against any legislation that might implicate their churches or charities in abortion, embryo-destructive research or same-sex marriage."[2]

The Manhattan Declaration was ecumenical dialogue in action:

> We, as Orthodox, Catholic, and Evangelical Christians, have gathered, beginning in New York on September 28, 2009, to make the following declaration, which we sign as individuals, not on behalf of our organizaton, but speaking to and from our communities. We act together in obedience to the one true God, the triune God of holiness and love, who has laid total claim on our lives and by that claim calls us with believers in all ages and all nations to seek and defend the good of all who bear his image. We set forth this delcaration in light of the truth that is grounded in holy

> Scripture, in natural human reason (which is itself, in our view, the gift of a beneficent God), and in the very nature of the human person. We call upon all people of goodwill, believers and nonbelievers alike, to consider carefully and reflect critically on the issues we here address as we, with St. Paul, commend this appeal to everyone's conscience in the sight of God.

At a Washington press conference two months after the launching of the manifesto, Professor George stepped aside to let Justin Cardinal Rigali of Philadelphia, make the case for the natural law basis for the Manhattan Declaration's position. Rigali referred to

> 1) The profound, inherent, and equal dignity of every human being as a creature fashioned in the very image of God, possessing inherent rights of equal dignity and life; 2) marriage as a conjugal union of man and woman, ordained by God from the creation, and historically understood by believers and non-believers alike, to be the most basic institution in society and; 3) religious liberty, which is grounded in the character of God, the example of Christ, and the inherent freedom and dignity of human beings created in the divine image.[3]

These are "principles that can be known and honored by men and women of good will even apart from divine revelation. They are principles of right reason and natural law."[4]

The Manhattan Declaration: A Call of Christian Conscience was conceived as a political coalition, based on the great paradigm of American moral reform and interreligious cooperation, namely, the Civil Rights Movement. According to the Manhattan Declaration, "The great Civil Rights crusades of the 1950s and '60s were led by Christians claiming the Scriptures and asserting the glory of the image of God in every human being regardless of race, religion, age or class."[5]

That the Manhattan Declaration chose the Civil Rights Movement as its paradigm is hardly surprising. The Civil Rights Movement has become the paradigm for virtually every political mobilization of Christianity since that time, including as the *New York Times* put it, "work to end the dehumanizing scourge of human trafficking and sexual slavery, bring compassionate care to AIDS sufferers in Africa, and assist in a myriad of other human rights causes—from providing clean water in developing nations to providing homes for tens of thousands of children orphaned by war, disease and gender discrimination."[6]

At Notre Dame in May 2009, both sides in the battle over the invitation extended to President Obama to speak there invoked the name of Martin Luther King and the Civil Rights Movement as a justification for their actions, whether those actions were civil disobedience or ordering the arrest of demonstrators for committing civil disobedience. We are talking about

something which has become *de rigueur*. Any group which wants moral credibility must wrap itself in the mantle of the Civil Rights Movement.

That includes, of course, the Catholic Church. The Catholic Church is suspect because it lacks diversity in the contemporary political sense of the word. It may include people from every nation on earth but all its members are, by definition, Catholic. All political coalitions based on the Civil Rights Movement model are by definition heterogeneous, i.e., composed of various groups espousing various beliefs but exhibiting unity in diversity. Coalitions of this sort involve, in other words, a subtle denigration of the Church as the *supreme ecclesia*. Coalitions of this sort are subtly Masonic because they give the impression that, unlike the Church, they are motivated by ideals which transcend narrow sectarian boundaries.

The Manhattan Declaration's characterization of the Civil Rights Movement as the great Christian crusade is deceptive in additional ways. It ignores the contribution Jews made to the Civil Rights Movement. It also ignores the motivation of the parties concerned. In his book *Fatal Embrace*, Benjamin Ginsberg corrects the notion that the Civil Rights Movement was a "Christian movement." It was, in reality, "a coalition of Jews and liberal Protestants and a smaller number of liberal Catholics within the Democratic party."[7] Similarly, when it came to motivation, the Jews and Christians who made up the Civil Rights Movement were less than altruistic because they

> sought both to increase their power inside the federal government and to expand the power of the federal government vis a vis the states and local governments. Alliance with blacks on a platform of civil rights was the critical instrument that served both those purposes. Enfranchising blacks while discrediting Southern and conservative forces as racists [*sic*] increased the power of liberal forces at the federal level. At the same time, civil rights and later Great Society programs served to increase the federal government's power vis a vis the states and other jurisdictions. . . . Northern Democratic liberals . . . found in the issue of civil rights a means of discrediting their opponents within the Democratic party–initially Southern conservatives and subsequently working-class ethnics in the North. . . . For Jews and other middle class liberals, support for civil rights was not only a moral commitment but also an important political tactic. By allying themselves with blacks, enfranchising black voters and delegitimating Southern White state and local governments, Jews and other liberals hoped to undermine the power of the same forces that had accused them of disloyalty.[8]

In case you didn't know, "working class ethnics in the North" is a code word for Catholics. The Manhattan Declaration is based on a movement that was used to destroy Catholic neighborhoods and Catholic political power. Why a cardinal would want to endorse something like this is anyone's guess, but

suddenly the Civil Rights Movement doesn't seem as benign as the Manhattan declarers make it out to be.

From the Catholic perspective, the high point of the Civil Rights Movement occurred when Martin Luther King arrived in Chicago during the summer of 1966, and began marching through Catholic neighborhoods like Marquette Park, where he was greeted by a barrage of rocks and bottles.

The icon which expresses in symbolic form what Notre Dame stands for is not the Golden Dome; it is the picture of Martin Luther King and Theodore Hesburgh, holding hands and singing "We Shall Overcome." That picture was taken during the summer of 1966 when Martin Luther King was engaged in the ethnic cleansing of Catholic neighborhoods in Chicago. The Civil Rights Movement began as an overt attack on the social fabric of the South but it quickly morphed into an attack on Catholic ethnic neighborhoods in the North.

Then as now, dialogue means "important" Catholics attacking Catholic nobodies as a way of destroying the political power of the Catholic Church in America, a power which was based on Catholic neighborhoods like Mayor Richard Daley, pere's, Bridgeport. Other people have noticed that baser motives were at work in the Civil Rights movement.

Invocation of the Civil Rights Movement as the paradigm of civic religion in America ignores the fact that baser motives were at work. Like Harold Cruse, Ginsberg feels that the Civil Rights Movement was payback for the lynching of Leo Frank. By promoting civil rights, Jews were able to exact revenge on the conservative Southern wing of the Democratic party, "a group that had been associated with the anti-Communist and anti-Semitic campaigns of the 1950s." When Martin Luther King arrived in Chicago in 1966, the Jews got to settle scores with the Catholic ethnics as well. Or as Ginsberg puts it: "Through participation in the civil rights movement, Jews were striking a blow against their own foes in the Democratic coalition as much as against the enemies of blacks."[9]

The real Civil Rights Movement turns out to be different than the one that constantly gets invoked as part of America's Civic Religion. This gap between appearance and reality raises a number of troubling questions about the historical basis of this model of coalition building.

Troubling questions abound even more the closer we examine the philosophical basis of the Manhattan Declaration. If the Manhattan Declaration is based on "principles that can be known and honored by men and women of good will even apart from divine revelation," why were Jews excluded as signatories? The same question applies to the Manhattan Declaration's invocation of the Civil Rights Movement. Martin Luther King certainly didn't exclude Jews from his organization. According to Murray Friedman's account of the Civil Rights Movement, the movement could not have succeeded without Jewish participation. Wouldn't a manifesto like the

Manhattan Declaration be more like the Civil Rights movement which it invokes as its model if it were more diverse and had Jewish signatories? Surely Midge Decter, author of the famous *Commentary* piece on the homosexual take-over of Fire Island, "The Boys on the Beach," is against gay marriage. By excluding Jews as signatories Professor George seems to imply that all Jews are in favor of same-sex marriage or that they are not open to the natural law. In an oblique reference to the Manhattan Declaration, Neocon *National Review* columnist Jonah Goldberg opined that "On the right, many conservatives have been trying to fashion something which might be called theological diversity amid moral unity. Culturally conservative Catholics, Protestants, and—increasingly—Jews find common cause." Surely, Jonah Goldberg is open to "principles that can be known and honored by men and women of good will even apart from divine revelation." Why then was he excluded from signing on when the Manhattan Declaration was pitched as a collaboration of Orthodox, Catholic, and Evangelical Christians?

The mystery deepens when we learn that Professor George is the heir apparent to the late Richard John Neuhaus, or, as Kirkpatrick puts it:

> With the death of the Rev. Richard John Neuhaus, a Lutheran minister turned Roman Catholic priest who helped bring evangelicals and Catholics together into a political movement, George has assumed his mantle as the reigning brain of the Christian Right.

The disingenuous nature of the *New York Times* article and the Manhattan Declaration itself has become too big to ignore. To talk about Richard John Neuhaus without mentioning *First Things* and Neoconservatism is like doing a remake of King Kong without the monkey. For those of you who spent the first decade of the 21st century living in a cave, *First Things* was the flagship of Neoconservatism, and Neoconservatism, as Murray Friedman, among others, pointed out, was a Jewish political movement. Or as *New York Times* columnist David Brooks defined the term "con is short for 'conservative' and neo is short for 'Jewish.'" How is it possible to name Professor George as the late Father Neuhaus's intellectual heir without talking about Neoconservatism? How is it possible to talk about a political coalition like the Religious Right without mentioning Neoconservatism? How is it possible to talk about Neoconservatism without including the Jews? Why, then, were Jews excluded as signatories from the Manhattan Declaration? And why wasn't this noticed by the *Times*, which is abnormally sensitive to issues of the Jewish persuasion? Why, then, was there no mention of Neoconservativism and the legacy of Catholic-Jewish collaboration at organs of opinion like *First Things*, *Crisis*, and *National Review*? Is the exclusion of Jews from the Manhattan Declaration a tacit admission that coalitions of this sort are instrinsically unworkable?

Neoconservatism evidently disappeared down the memory hole of contemporary discourse, and it's difficult not to see its disappearance as

intentional because in leaving out its immediate predecessor (while mentioning distant relatives like the Civil Rights Movement) the Manhattan Declaration laid claim to an originality which it does not have. There is too much history here, as Ginsberg points out, which could contextualize its claims if it were available. By omitting this history, the Manhattan Declaration and its apologists deny us the ability to learn from the past. Perhaps both George and Kirkpatrick had Santayana's dictum in mind: "Those who refuse to learn from history are condemned to repeat it." Perhaps that is the point. Perhaps we are being pushed into a new arrangement, the Manhattan Declaration, which condemns us to repeat the mistakes of the old arrangement, Neoconservatism. The omission of Richard John Neuhaus's political affiliations prevents us from seeing the political affiliations of his heir apparent, as well as depriving us of an understanding of who the true beneficiaries of interfaith dialogue are.

Professor George did not spring full-blown from the mind of Zeus. He may be, as the *Times* claims, the intellectual heir of Richard John Neuhaus, but Neuhaus could just as easily be described as the intellectual heir of William Buckley, or Michael Novak, or Deal Hudson, former editor of the now defunct *Crisis*, a magazine which came into existence ten years before *First Things*. All of these men claimed to be Catholic spokesmen for reformist political movements, but they were in reality creations of Jewish money men like Marvin Liebman, or foundations like the Bradley Foundation, or think tanks like the American Enterprise Institutute, and their careers—but more importantly, their ideas—were a function of the money those institutions disbursed. "He who pays the piper calls the tune" has more relevance in the realm of foundation-backed ideas than it has to music.

The story of the Manhattan Declaration needs to be integrated into what we know about recent history, in particular the history of the Cultural Revolution of the '60s and its aftermath. From a political point of view, the Cultural Revolution of the '60s began with the murder of John F. Kennedy. From a religious point of view, it began with the Curran tenure battle at Catholic University in the spring of 1967, followed by Hesburgh's theft of Notre Dame university in the summer of 1967 with the issuance of the Land o' Lakes statement, followed by the theologians' rebellion against *Humanae Vitae* in the summer of 1968. Using the Second Vatican Council as its stalking horse, the revolutionaries occupied the Church's educational system and used as their base of operations as a fifth column representing the interests of the WASP ruling class, and the Rockefellers in particular. That Revolution begat a counter-revolution.

From a political point of view, the Counter-Revolution began when Richard Nixon, following the plan articulated by Kevin Phillips in his book *The Emerging Republican Majority*, convinced large numbers of Catholic ethnics to abandon their traditional home in the Democratic Party and vote Republican in 1968. The Catholic ethnics put Richard Nixon in the White

House in 1968 and 1972. And as some sign of their power Nixon hired a young writer by the name of Pat Buchanan to help him write speeches that appealed to the group of voters that made up the ethnic revival of the '70s. The religious counter-revolution began in 1968 when Lyman Stebbins, a New York WASP who had previously converted to Catholicism, founded Catholics United for the Faith.

For 20 years, the counter-revolution continued to grow with the counter-counter revolution growing along beside it. The counter-counter revolution's most famous cultural artifact was the Norman Lear TV sitcom "All in the Family," in which Carroll O'Connor played a Catholic bigot from Queens known as Archie Bunker. When O'Connor died, Rob Reiner, who played Bunker's son-in-law Meathead, spilled the beans by admitting that "All in the Family" was conceived as a form of social engineering to teach Catholic ethnics to be more tolerant.

Then in 1989, the Berlin Wall came down, followed by the collapse of the Soviet Union, and by the early '90s the glue which had held the coalition known as the anti-Communist crusade together disappeared, and Catholics and Jews resumed the antagonistic positions they had held during the '30s when the Legion of Decency defeated Hollywood and imposed the production code.

The best expression of this change was Pat Buchanan's challenge to George Bush in the presidential primary of 1992. For the first time since 1968, a Catholic had emerged from the Republican coalition and began to articulate specifically Catholic concerns, like blue-collar job loss and immigration's effect on wages and culture in addition to things like abortion. The movement came to be known as paleoconservatism, and it was linked to *Chronicles* and the Rockford institute. The Catholics had gotten nothing from the Reagan administration on abortion, and in exchange for that nothing, their own economic interests had taken a beating because of the Reagan administration's anti-union stance.

Now the Catholic repressed had returned, and the Jews were upset. The counter-counterrevolution continued to build steam when Bill Buckley attacked his conservative brothers in arms Pat Buchanan and Joe Sobran as anti-Semites in the pages of *National Review.*

Beginning in the mid-'80s, the godfather of Neoconservatism, Irving Kristol, had taken over the Bradley Foundation and began using it as a financial weapon against the Catholic counter-revolution by funding various journals which turned out to be nothing more than neocon front operations of the sort that Trotskyites like Kristol had created in the '50s with the help of the CIA, *Encounter* being the most famous example. As of the '80s Chronicles was getting support from the Bradley Foundation, but Richard John Neuhaus, then editor of the Rockford-backed *Religion and Society* report, saw an

opportunity, and with the backing of Midge Decter and Norman Podhoretz, hijacked a $250,000 Bradley Foundation grant and started *First Things*.

First Things, which was the direct predecessor of the Manhattan Declaration, was created to destroy the political and religious wings of the Catholic counter-revolution that had come into existence to protest the WASP-Rockefeller-sexual-liberation coalition of the '60s. That coalition, which had close ties to the Civil Rights Movement, came into existence to destroy the political power of the Catholic Church in America by promoting the use of contraception (and later abortion) among Catholics. Are we beginning to see a pattern? Coalition is another word for the disruption of Catholic unity and the destruction of Catholic political power.

Richard John Neuhaus founded *First Things* in response to Jewish concern about the rise of Pat Buchanan and paleoconservatism. I have told this story before, but it is interesting to consult Benjamin Ginsberg, who wrote *Fatal Embrace*, when paleoconservatism was considered a very real threat in Jewish circles. Beneath the façade of interfaith collaboration on the Civil Rights Movement model, Ginsberg discerns bedrock ethnic identity, which in America means religious affiliation. So the paleocons, led by Patrick Buchanan, "are socially conservative" and "some, like Buchanan, are conservative Catholics who reject the reforms mandated by liberal popes and the Vatican II conference [*sic*]."[10] They were disgruntled in the early '90s because they had been swindled by the Republicans on the right-to-life issue, or, as Ginsberg puts it, "Though Reagan and Bush paid lip service to the concerns of these groups by praising the right-to-life movement and other moral goals, both lacked a genuine commitment to social issues that eventually became apparent and led to a sense of betrayal among social conservatives."[11]

Pat Buchanan was the Ahmadinejad of his day. He was the revenant of Father Coughlin, Henry Ford, and Charles Lindbergh all rolled up into one. He was the most significant threat to Jewish hegemony over American culture since America First, and Ginsberg's description of him shows how dire the threat seemed to American Jews as of 1993:

> after a long hiatus, anti-Semitism has once again become a significant phenomenon on the political right. The most noteworthy expression was, of course, Pat Buchanan's charge that the Persian Gulf war was promoted by the Israeli Defense Ministry and its "amen corner" in the United States and his subsequent description of Congress as "Israeli-occupied" territory.[12]

Richard John Neuhaus's patrons Midge Decter and Norman Podhoretz were every bit as concerned about the Pat Buchanan phenomenon and paleoconservatism as was Benjamin Ginsberg. Seeing an opportunity, Neuhaus became a double agent. While still working as editor of the Rockford Institute's *Religion and Society* newsletter, Neuhaus was undermining the

institution which published it, referring at cocktail parties in Manhattan to the Rockford Institute as located in "the fever swamps" of intellectual discourse. Finally, the hostility came out in the open and after a high speed car chase in Manhattan to secure the filing cabinet containing donor names, Neuhaus succeeded in diverting a $250,00 Bradley Foundation grant from Rockford to be used as the founding nest egg for *First Things*.

The founding of *First Things* was just one skirmish in a decade-long campaign which involved the subversion of just about every Catholic journal of opinion by Neoconservative agents of influence. Dale Vree, editor of the *New Oxford Review* recounted his big chance when a Jewish donor from the East Coast showed up at his offices and offered *NOR* money if it would support 1) free market economics and 2) a muscular American foreign policy. Vree declined, but the editorial record of other Catholic publications speaks for itself.

Even though Professor George has been identified as the Richard John Neuhaus's heir apparent without any reference to the Neoconservatism Neuhaus promoted at *First Things,* the legacy of Neoconservative subversion is apparent in the agenda of the Manhattan Declaration. In fact, the agenda has remained unchanged, even if the Neoconservative label has become an embarrassment to the agenda's promoters. The Manhattan Declaration is, in effect, the same deal which Dale Vree turned down, souped up a bit by the addition of heavy-duty natural law philosophizing. It is part and parcel of the cynical Republican exploitation of Catholic sentiment on abortion which led to the paleocon uprising in 1992. Catholics in Pennsylvania awoke to this scam when they rejected Rick Santorum's attempt to get re-elected in 2006. Santorum, who tried to get Catholic voters in Pennsylvania enthused over bombing Iran, ended up losing the election instead, and as consolation prize took a job at the American Enterprise Institute, where his Jewish backers got to pay his salary directly. Professor George was a supporter of Senator Santorum.

George's message is simple. Catholic bishops should concentrate on abortion and stop talking about economics. In particular they should stop "lobbying for detailed economic policies like progressive tax rates, higher minimum wage." Or, as David Kirkpatrick put it,

> Last spring, George was invited to address an audience that included many bishops at a conference in Washington. He told them with typical bluntness that they should stop talking about the many policy issues they have taken up in the name of social justice. They should concentrate their authority on "the moral social" issues like abortion, embryonic stem-cell research and same-sex marriage, where, he argued, the natural law and Gospel principles were clear. To be sure, he said, he had no objection to bishops' "making utter nuisances of themselves" about poverty and injustice, like the Old Testament prophets, as long as they did not advocate specific remedies. They should stop lobbying for detailed

> economic policies like progressive tax rates, higher minimum wage, and, presumably, the expansion of health care—"matters of public policy upon which Gospel principles by themselves do not resolve differences of opinion among reasonable and well-informed people of good will,". . .

It is difficult to see how this strategy is based on "principles of right reason and natural law." If unaided human reason can conclude that adultery is wrong, then it is equally capable of seeing that theft and murder (either by suction curette or by unmanned drones in an unjust war) are equally wrong. Professor George cannot invoke the application of the moral law in one instance and then revoke it in another, not if he wants to be taken seriously. But that is precisely what he does, and, in spite of his anointing by the *New York Times*, that is precisely why he is not taken seriously and why his coalition is going to bring about the very opposite of what they claim they want to achieve.

George never tells us what his economic views are, but he implies that the whole economic thing is hopelessly complicated and best left to the experts. This idea is, of course, congenial to the leveraged buy-out kings who bankroll think tanks like the American Enterprise Institute, which funds Catholic "thinkers" like Rick Santorum and Michael Novak because it needs Catholics to lend an aura of moral probity to their predatory looting operations. In a book which by its title purports to bring sex and economics together in a consistent theory,[13] George claims that marriage "is about children and property," but he remains explicit on sex and vague on economics and never really brings the two issues together in any coherent way. At one point he cites approvingly James Q. Wilson's thesis that "the marriage system made possible by the emergence of individual land ownership in turn helped to make England 'the natural place for the emergence of capitalism,'" but in keeping with his policy of explicitness on sexual issues and vagueness on economics, he never tells us that "emergence of land ownership" was another word for the looting of Church property.

This a-historical acceptance of the status quo is typical of libertarian economics and finds expression in another essay in the same book by Jennifer Roback Morse, "Why Unilateral Divorce Has No Place in a Free Society," which gets more specific about markets, but never quite explains whether they help or hinder marriage. Morse is handicapped from the start because she has to admit that the libertarian position on sexuality contradicts not only her own views but also what Professor George would call "natural reason." George is a proponent of the metaphysically parsimonious "New Natural Law Theory" which takes seriously the Enlightenment idea that one can't derive an "ought" from an "is." The fact that "Libertarians want to combine the 'fiscal right,' which wants minimal government taxation, spending, and regulation with the 'lifestyle left,' which wants minimal governmental definition of proper sexual, marital, and family behavior" puts Catholic Libertarians like Roback

Morse in a bind because "it is not possible for a society to be both fiscally conservative and lifestyle liberal. It sounds good on paper, but in practice it simply is not possible."

Instead of abandoning Libertarianism as a fatally flawed ideology, Roback Morse attempts to square the circle by creating the philosophical equivalent of a political coalition on the Manhattan Declaration model. She does this because she is attracted simultaneously to the idea that "marriage [is] a unique social institution that deserves to be defended on its own terms, and not as a special case of something else" and because

> One of the attractive features of the market as a social institution is its self-regulating character. Set up a society with property rights, contract law, and a court and police system; populate it with people who have a functioning conscience and sense of reciprocity; give the system a push—and it runs itself.

Roback Morse tries to reconcile these two views and fails because these views cannot be reconciled. This is so for a very simple reason: the moral law applies to both sexual and economic intercourse and neither marriage nor a sound economy is compatible with "the posture of a night-watchman state." Libertarianism, like the Manhattan Declaration, invokes the moral law when it suits its purposes, something that Professor Roback Morse concedes when she writes that:

> Libertarians recognize that a free market needs a culture of law-abidingness, promise-keeping, and respect for contracts. Similarly, a free society needs a culture that supports and sustains marriage as the normative institution for the begetting, bearing and rearing of children.

Flawed fundamental principles lead to flawed applications in the real world. Professor Roback Morse proves this axiom when she takes on the problem of welfare, especially to unmarried mothers with dependent children:

> The libertarian approach to caring for the dependent is usually described in terse form as "let families and private charity take care of it and get the government out of the way." This position is sometimes ridiculed as unrealistic or attacked as harsh. But the libertarian position, once fully fleshed out, is both humane and realistic.

Once again ideology trumps history in Libertarian thought. The only way Libertarian social solutions sound plausible is by ignoring the historical causes which led to the problem. Poor Laws in England are an example of state intervention, but they became necessary only in the aftermath of the great period of capital formation in England otherwise known as the Reformation, otherwise known as the looting of Church property. When English culture and England's economic system were under the control of the Catholic Church, there were no Poor Laws. If there had been no looting (i.e., no

Reformation), if England had continued for the next 900 years under the regime which had ruled it for the 900 years previous to the Reformation, there would have been no need of state welfare because huge amounts of property would have continued to be dedicated to the common good. Poverty of the sort that became endemic to English life, poverty of the sort that Charles Dickens wrote about three centuries after the looting of Church property had taken place, was unknown in England before the Reformation, and it was unknown in England for almost an entire millennium before the looting that gave birth to Capitalism because economic exchange was subordinated to the moral law, and the moral law was enforced by the Catholic Church. The state had to step in to keep Englishmen from starving to death only after Capitalism had destroyed the social order. If Professor Roback Morse were familiar with encyclicals like *Rerum Novarum*, she would know that socialism follows inexorably from Capitalism. The Catholic position on the relationship between marriage and markets is that low wages of the sort favored by Libertarians like Professor Morse endanger the existence of the family, something the whole world was aware of by the end of the 19th century.

Those who advocate the natural law need to understand that morality is all of one piece, and that adultery, theft, and murder are all wrong. Even the morally challenged folks at the *New York Times* have figured this out. Anyone who claims that we are supposed to ignore nine of the Ten Commandments in the interest of political effectiveness is either a fool or trying to instrumentalize both philosophy and morals for political purposes. Those who make this claim also destroy their own reputations as thinkers. Professor George is part of the cadre of Neoconservative Catholics who destroyed their credibility during the run up to the Iraq war in 2003. As Kirkpatrick points out:

> The intentional killing of innocent civilians in war is as grave a moral crime as abortion, George says, but what constitutes a "just war" is a more complicated judgment call. Before the 2003 invasion of Iraq, he wrote an op-ed article in the *Wall Street Journal* arguing that the attack was not necessarily unjust and might even be a moral obligation. . . . But the opposition to banning abortion and embryo-destructive research is "straightforward."

The "straightforward" immorality of the Iraq War was apparent to Pope John Paul II. It was apparent to many Catholics not in the pay of Neocon-controlled foundations. Neoconservative Catholics like Robert George and George Weigel lost their credibility by slavishly backing the Bush Administration's unjust war. Michael Novak, who bragged about the candle-light dinners he had had with the pope, couldn't get an audience to plead his case at the Vatican because the idea that America's invasion of Iraq could be squared with the Just War principles of the Catholic Church was patently absurd. When the Scottish Catholic philosopher John Haldane suggested that there might

be a disconnect between "the principles of right reason and natural law" and the foreign policy agenda of the Republican Party or that the Republicans lost the 2008 election because Catholics "took moral exception to some of the policies pursued by the Bush administration," such as "the running sore of structural deprivation running through American society, or the prosecution of an unjust war," George responded with derision, sarcasm, and ridicule.

> When I asked George about the letter, he was derisive. "John, thanks for the advice!" he said sarcastically. "Gosh, I wish we would have taken it. We would have the strong and vibrant social conservative movement that you guys have in Great Britain!"

So much for "His critics, including many of his fellow Catholic scholars, argue that he is turning the church into a tool of the Republican Party."

If we were to ask which institution can give us an infallibly reliable guide to the relationship between adultery, theft and murder, the answer would be the Catholic Church and only the Catholic Church. Any coalition which silences the Church on any of these issues, as the Manhattan Declaration does, is an instrument of political control. The beneficiaries of these coalitions are not the Catholics, be they bishops or laymen, who are asked to join them. The beneficiaries are the Republican Party and the money men behind the Republican Party, who pay the salaries of the agents who promote their ideas. If Robert George didn't exist, Karl Rove, a self-proclaimed Robert George fan, would have had to invent him, or another representative in the line of Buckley, Novak, Neuhaus, and Hudson. Conservatism is not only the name of a failed political movement; it is another name for Catholics being paid to control Catholics, by confining the operation of their minds to ideas congenial to the rich and powerful.

To claim that unaided reason can know that adultery is wrong but not that prosecution of an unjust war is equally wrong so contradicts the mind's ability to grasp the truth, that we are forced to look for other than rational motives when seeking to explain the ideas being proposed. As Kirkpatrick points out, George never lets an opportunity pass to quote with disapproval "Hume's famous formulation, 'reason is, and ought only to be, the slave of the passions and may never pretend to any office other than to serve and obey them.'" George's disapproval notwithstanding, there are many passions and appetites, and the craving for money and human respect are two of the most powerful, even more powerful for some than the sexual appetite. Professor George has subordinated the natural law to a political agenda. On just about every issue, the real criterion of whether the natural law should be taken seriously comes down to whether the policy in question is in conformity with the agenda of the Republican Party.

George claims that by limiting their focus the Catholic Bishops will gain in political effectiveness, but the evidence from the Neoconservative era all militates against drawing this conclusion.

After explaining the nature of the coalition which made up the Civil Rights Movement, Ginsberg is equally frank in talking about the neoconservative alliance which succeeded it. At the heart of that alliance was the Republican or neoconservative strategy on abortion. Catholics were told that if they went along on economic issues that went against their own interests ("Blue collar unionized workers [i.e., Catholics]," the Republicans would do something about abortion. Catholics, Ginsberg tells us, "were among the major victims of Reaganomics." This was a cruel hoax, because "Though Reagan and Bush paid lip service to the concerns of these groups by praising the right-to-life movement and other moral goals, both lacked a genuine commitment to social issues that eventually became apparent and led to a sense of betrayal among social conservatives." This was so because the Jews were the senior partners in the Neocon alliance, and the Jews were not interested in doing anything about abortion. In fact, Ginsberg continues, "many neocons are fond of saying privately that social issues are merely useful bait with which to attract the votes of the riff-raff."[14]

So, first it was Michael Novak, and then it was Rick Santorum, who co-sponsored a bill on stem cell research with Arlen Spector which received Robby George's support. And then it was Richard John Neuhaus. And then it was Chris "hate crimes" Smith. Through it all we are all supposed to pretend that we can't see the man behind the curtain operating the money machine, which is the ultimate source of these ideas and coalitions.

The link between Michael Novak and the American Enterprise Institute is even more obvious than the link between Richard John Neuhaus and the Bradley Foundation under Irving Kristol's protégé Michael Joyce. No possible interpretation of the natural law can come to the conclusion that adultery is wrong but theft, even in sophisticated forms such as leveraged buy-outs, is not. Hence, we must seek the rationale of George's advice to the bishops to downplay economics in places other than in the natural law. The make up of the board of trustees of the American Enterprise Institute might be a good place to start. David Rubenstein, co-founder of the Carlyle Group, a private equity firm which plunders companies by taking them over and loading them down with debt, is one of the 24 trustees of the American Enterprise Institute. Marc Lipschultz, a partner with Kohlberg Kravis Roberts, another private equity firm, is another. Upon closer examination, the Manhattan Declaration rests not upon the natural law, but upon another sort of foundation, The Bradley Foundation.

What conclusions are we to draw from all this, other than the feeling that Catholics have been duped every time they allowed themselves to be drawn into political alliances? The main conclusion is that unity is better

than dialogue. When the Catholic Church was strong and unified, she had a positive effect on American culture, as for example, when the Catholics of Philadelphia boycotted Warner Brothers theaters in the 1930s and forced Hollywood Jews to accept the Production Code and ban nudity and obscenity from their films. Or when Msgr. Ryan stood up to Margaret Sanger and the Rockefeller interests and defeated their plan for government-funded birth control. Once the Church chose dialogue over unity, she lost whatever power she had to influence the culture and earned only the contempt of her enemies in return.

Unity with your friends and fellow-believers, in other words, is better than dialogue with your enemies. If we ever needed proof, we have almost 50 years of experience with the failed experiment known as Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

In the years following Vatican II, dialogue became the vehicle for bringing the Catholic mind under Jewish control. Dialogue has also become a synonym for subversion of Church teaching.

Other people have noticed the same thing. Having watched with amazement as House Democrats acceded to the U.S. Catholic bishops' demand that abortion funding be removed from their health care bill, Pat Buchanan wondered, "Is the Church Militant Back?" When the Church is united and acts on her own, unfettered by self-imposed political constraints, good things happen.

Kirkpatrick cites the Stupak amendment, the bishops' successful attempt to get abortion funding stripped from the Obama administration's health care bill as an example of the successful implementation of George's strategy when in fact it shows the opposite of what the Manhattan Declaration is proposing. Abortion got stripped from the health care bill when the bishops acted in a unified manner with a resolve which they never had during the birth control battles of the '60s and which they could not have mustered if they were working under Republican-controlled restraints in concert with other Christian denominations. It was Catholic Democrats in the House who cast the decisive votes against abortion. Working in concert with Jews against abortion is unthinkable.

George tries to drag religious liberty into the discussion, but it's clear that Catholic doctrine is going to suffer from the inevitable political horse-trading that this involves. Instead of asserting the historical truth that the Church has never repudiated her right to coerce the baptized, including recalcitrant politicians, George comes out in favor of civil disobedience, based on the historically false claim that, "Through the centuries, Christianity has taught that civil disobedience is not only permitted, but sometimes required." This is simply not true. Aquinas may have condoned overthrowing tyrants in extreme cases, but this necessitated a form of warfare to be waged according to the Just War Theory, the same theory that George, Novak, Hudson, Neuhaus, Weigel, et al threw overboard in their haste to justify the invasion of Iraq and get more

funding from their Neocon benfactors. "Civil disobedience" is a term invented by Henry David Thoreau. It has no place in Catholic theology. The Church counseled patience and suffering and in extreme cases of manifest injustice the overthrow of wicked regimes, but it never condoned "civil disobedience." The source of this claim lies neither in Scripture nor Tradition, but, unsurprisingly in George's reading of the Civil Rights Movement, in particular the tract written by Christian Socialist and Catholic apostate Michael Harrington, *Letter from a Birmingham Jail.*

> There is no more eloquent defense of the rights and duties of religious conscience than the one offered by Martin Luther King, Jr., in his *Letter from a Birmingham Jail.* Writing from an explicitly Christian perspective, and citing Christian writers such as Augustine and Aquinas, King taught that just laws elevate and ennoble human beings because they are rooted in the moral law whose ultimate source is God Himself. Unjust laws degrade human beings. Inasmuch as they can claim no authority beyond sheer human will, they lack any power to bind in conscience. King's willingness to go to jail, rather than comply with legal injustice, was exemplary and inspiring.

Rather than accept a hollow and specious religious freedom and the dubious privilege of going to jail, the bishops would do better to concentrate on restoring the unity of all believers, including Catholic politicians, who would then act more like Congressman Stupak than the late Senator Kennedy. Dialogue does nothing but weaken this resolve. The net result is dialogue with "Catholic" universities like Notre Dame—another fruit of Vatican II and another colossal waste of time.

What is true of abortion is also true of the re-admission of the Anglicans. After almost 500 years of schism and almost 50 years of fruitless palaver, the pope re-admitted Anglicans disgusted with feminist bishops and openly homosexual clergy without a word of dialogue. The Archbishop of Canterbury, who found out about the merger when the rest of the world did, was the last one to know.

Buchanan mentioned Catholic-Jewish relations as one of the main areas of change in American life:

> The Vatican has reaffirmed that Catholics in interfaith dialogues have a moral right if not a duty to convert Jews, and reaffirmed the doctrine that Christ's covenant with his church canceled out and supersedes the Old Testament covenant with the Jews. When Abe Foxman, screech owl of the Anti-Defamation League, railed that this marks a Catholic return to such "odious concepts as 'supercessionism,'" he was politely ignored.

Both the ADL and *Culture Wars* have concluded that Catholic-Jewish dialogue has failed, and Catholics are finally awakening to the fact that this dialogue

has failed because the Jews have used it as a cover for their hidden agenda of control from the beginning.

Abe Foxman was outraged by what he considered a *volte face* on dialogue, but the simple fact remained: whenever the bishops engaged in dialogue with the Jews, they repudiated the Gospel. Conversely, whenever they acted on their own and reaffirmed the Gospel, they invariably outraged the Jews. This leads me to refine my previous statement: the Church can proclaim the Gospel or she can have good relations with the Jews, but dialogue, which is to say both at the same time, is impossible.

Why is that? Well, anyone who has read The Gospel of St. John or the Acts of the Apostles or St. Paul's Epistle to the Thessalonians should know the answer. It's because the Jews rejected Christ, and in rejecting Christ they rejected Logos, and in rejecting Logos, they became, as St. Paul put it, "enemies of the entire human race." Dialogue, in other words, is not possible without *logos*. This rejection of logos in general and the Logos made flesh is now the core of Jewish identity, and it will remain so until they reject their rejection and accept Christ as their savior. Michael Medved said the same thing. In a symposium in the September 2009 issue of the American Jewish Committee's publication, *Commentary*, on Norman Podhoretz's latest book, he wrote that "For most American Jews, the core of their Jewish identity isn't solidarity with Israel; it's rejection of Christianity."

Michael Medved has articulated the fundamental Jewish idea. As Richard Weaver told us "Ideas have consequences," and one consequence of the fundamental Jewish idea is blasphemy. Over 40 years of dialogue led America's Catholic bishops into a denial of the Gospel, but it didn't put a stop to Jewish blasphemy. At the time that the American bishops were trying to placate Abe Foxman, another Jew, Larry David, was busy urinating on a picture of Jesus Christ during a segment of the HBO sitcom "Curb Your Enthusiasm." When David's Catholic secretary uses the bathroom after him, she mistakes David's urine for Jesus's tears and claims that the picture is weeping. This instance of Jewish blasphemy brought forth fundraising letters from fire-breathing defenders of the Faith, who demanded that Catholics "Take action" and send in a contribution, but they couldn't bring themselves to say that Larry David was a Jew, and that the Jewish penchant for blasphemy goes back to the central Jewish document, the Talmud, and that this behavior has to do with, as Michael Medved put it, the "rejection of Christianity," which lies at the core of Jewish identity.

No one, it seems, is allowed to connect the dots. Catholics can't connect the dots for a very simple reason: connecting the dots leaves one open to the charge of anti-Semitism. In May 2009, following the appearance of my article on Deborah Lipstadt and Holocaust Denial, the ADL put me on their most wanted list. This means that I moved out of the realm of "dynamic silence." Since the ADL has been getting the magazine for years (They are our most

faithful readers. We never have to send them a second renewal notice.), I can only assume that something must have happened recently to bump up my status. What happened is very simple: *Culture Wars* has broken the lock which has kept the Catholic mind under Jewish control for the past 40 years. The ADL realizes that the Church is heading in the other direction on the issues the Jews consider important. After 40 years of unprecedented advances in subversion and covert warfare, the Jews finally started to lose their control over the Catholic mind.

Dialogue is a failed experiment. It had no roots in tradition. In just about every instance it involved the bishops in compromising the gospel. As the Manhattan Declaration made clear, the main requirement for dialogue is a willingness to suppress some Catholic truth of importance to the person engaged in dialogue. There was always an aura of make-believe surrounding the Church's dialogue with the world which began in the wake of the Second Vatican Council. The main element of make believe had to do with wishing away the Church's enemies. It turns out that the Church's enemies did not disappear. Instead, they used to their feigned status as friends to gain unprecedented hegemony over the Church they never stopped trying to destroy.

The Church Fathers were wiser than their successors. They understood, as Augustine said, that "Heretics, Jews and Heathens have made a unity against Unity." History is another word for the story of this alliance and its war against the Church. In spite of the illusions generated by the Second Vatican Council, nothing has changed. As A. E. Houseman wrote about sobering up after a drinking binge,

> I was I; my things were wet
>
> The world it was the old world yet.

As we sober up from the intoxication generated by the failed experiments of the '60s, we are left with certain fundamental truths. There can be no dialogue without logos. The only antidote to rejection of Logos is rejection of that rejection, otherwise known as conversion. Since dialogue has made conversion impossible, we must dispense with dialogue and return to the tradition that promoted evangelization and conversion as the antidote to the world's ills because unity with fellow believers is more important than the ability to chatter on endlessly with our enemies.

Chapter Eight

Jewish Nazis

Dorothy Rabinowitz announced the death of multiculturalism in the *Wall Street Journal*. Citing the pronouncements of the prime ministers of England, France, and Germany, she crowed:

> Who would have believed that in the space of a few weeks the leaders of the three major European powers would publicly denounce multiculturalism and declare in so many words that it was a proven disaster and a threat to society?

Rabinowitz claimed that multiculturalism had "led to segregated communities"; it had also "helped nurture radical Islam's terrorist cells." Rabinowitz goes on to claim that multiculturalism, which she describes as "the unofficial established religion of the universities," is "a faith whose requirements have shaped every aspect of cultural, economic and political life in Western democracies for the last 50 years."[1]

Twenty years previously, Rabinowitz was worried about Pat Buchanan and Joe Sobran. Twenty years previously she was writing to the editors of papers like the *Philadelphia Inquirer* demanding that that paper drop Joe Sobran as one of its columnists. Now she's worried about Major Hasan. For those of you who have trouble keeping mass murderers straight in your mind, in November 2009 Major Nidal Malik Hasan opened fire in Fort Hood killing 12 fellow soldiers and wounding 32 others. Rabinowitz attributes this attack to a combination of "Hasan's well-documented jihadist sympathies" and multiculturalism. She ends her piece by claiming that when Major Hasan goes on trial, "The forces of multiculturalist piety, which played so central a role in advancing this Army major and concealing the menace he posed, will be the invisible presence on trial with him."

Associating multiculturalism with Islam is a daring rhetorical move, especially when that rhetorical move is made by a Jew, because Dorothy Rabinowitz must know, even if the dumb *goyim* who read her columns in the *Wall Street Journal* do not, that multiculturalism has been a completely Jewish creation from start to finish. For more than 100 years, Jews in America have

been promoting multiculturalism as a strategy for weakening the dominant culture and thereby enhancing Jewish power.

In his essay "Jewish Involvement in Shaping American Immigration policy, 1881-1965: A Historical Review"[2] University of California at Long Beach Professor Kevin MacDonald shows in exhaustive detail how Jewish organizations supported multiculturalism almost from the moment when eastern European Jews arrived in significant numbers on these shores. According to MacDonald, the "historical record supports the proposition that making the United States into a multicultural society has been a major goal of organized Jewry beginning in the 19th century." The main way in which Jews promoted multiculturalism is by changing this nation's immigration laws. "Jews," according to MacDonald, "have been 'the single most persistent pressure group favoring a liberal immigration policy' in the United States in the entire immigration debate beginning in 1881." MacDonald cites one Jewish authority after another to back up his case. According to Neuringer:

> Immigration had constituted a prime object of concern for practically every major Jewish defense and community relations organization. Over the years their spokesmen had assiduously attended congressional hearings and the Jewish effort was of the utmost importance in establishing and financing such nonsectarian groups as the National Liberal Immigration League and the Citizens Committee for Displaced Persons.

According to Nathan C. Belth:

> In Congress, through all the years when the immigration battles were being fought, the names of Jewish legislators were in the forefront of the liberal forces: from Adolph Sabath to Samuel Dickstein and Emanuel Celler in the House and from Herbert H. Lehman to Jacob Javits in the Senate. Each in his time was leader of the ADL and of major organizations concerned with democratic development.

Indeed, writing in 1914, the sociologist Edward A. Ross had a clear sense that liberal immigration policy was exclusively a Jewish issue.

The Jewish promotion of multiculturalism in America had two main goals: 1) "maximizing the number of Jewish immigrants," and "opening up the United States to immigration from all of the peoples of the world." Both goals paradoxically used "diversity" as a stalking horse to advance Jewish ethnocentrism because the point of multiculturalism is not so much the promotion of diversity as it is the demographic dilution of homogeneity. Jews wanted to weaken the majority culture because they always felt uncomfortable in unified coherent cultures. The defenders of immigration restriction during this period made it clear that America was a country settled and inhabited by Christians from northwestern Europe. This implied racial superiority in the minds of the Jewish proponents of restrictionism but not the legislators, who claimed that

> the northern European, and particularly Anglo-Saxons, made this country. . . . It is a good country. It suits us. And what we assert is that we are not going to surrender it to somebody else or allow other people, no matter what their merits, to make it something different." Representative Leavitt saw through the diversity ploy when he complained that the Jews were "the one great historic people who have maintained the identity of their race throughout centuries because they believe sincerely that they are a chosen people, with certain ideals to maintain, and knowing that the loss of racial identity means a change of ideals.

The restrictionists complained that the Jews were attempting to shape U.S. immigration policy according to Jewish interests and not in the interests of the country which welcomed them as immigrants:

> Hence the endeavor of the Jews to control the immigration policy of the United States. . . . The systematic campaign in newspapers to break down all arguments for restriction and to claim nativist fears is waged by and for one race. Hebrew money is behind the National Liberal Immigration League and its numerous publications. . . . literature that proves the blessings of immigration to all classes in America emanates from subtle Hebrew brains.

The reference to "subtle Hebrew brains" probably excludes Dorothy Rabinowitz from our discussion, but the purpose of multiculturalism has remained constant, as has the Jewish support for it. The purpose of multiculturalism has always been to subvert coherent cultures, weaken the majority, and thereby enhance the Jews' power. Or, as MacDonald puts it,

> ethnic and religious pluralism serves external Jewish interest because Jews become just one of many ethnic groups. This results in the diffusion of political and cultural influence among the various ethnic and religious groups, and it becomes difficult or impossible to develop unified, cohesive groups of gentiles united in their opposition to Judaism. Historically, major anti-Semitic movements have tended to erupt in societies that have been, apart from the Jews, religiously and/or ethnically homogeneous.

The restrictionists included organized labor, who feared competition from new immigrants who were a perennial source of cheap labor.

"During this period, the immigration issue was also economic. Native businesses feared cutthroat Jewish business practices." Jewish factory owners, the group most likely to be the backers of Jewish organizations, favored immigration as a source of cheap labor. During this period (1914) Edward A. Ross described gentile resentment for "being obliged to engage in a humiliating and undignified scramble to keep his trade or his clients against the Jewish invader—suggesting a rather broad-based concern with Jewish economic competition."

The early opponents of multiculturalism also feared Jews as agents of cultural subversion:

> Our whole system of amusements has been taken over by men who came here on the crest of the south and east European immigration. They produce our horrible film stories; they compose and dish out to us our jazz music, they write many of the books we read, and edit our magazines and newspapers.

Jewish immigrants were also "widely perceived to be . . . disproportionately involved in radical political movements," an involvement often acknowledged by the Jewish press. In one of its editorials, *The American Hebrew* pointed out that "we must not forget the immigrants from Russia and Austria will be coming from countries infested with Bolshevism, and it will require more than a superficial effort to make good citizens out of them."

The fact that Jewish immigrants from Eastern Europe were viewed as "infected with Bolshevism . . . unpatriotic, alien, unassimilable" resulted in a wave of anti-Semitism in the 1920s and contributed to the restrictive immigration legislation of the period. Almost a decade after the immigration debate ended with the triumph of the restrictionists in 1924, Jewish immigration was still having consequences for American identity. As MacDonald points out, "In Philadelphia in the 1930s, fully 72.2 percent of the Communist Party members were the children of Jewish immigrants who came to the United States in the late 19th and early 20th century."

During the 1920s, Franz Boas, the Prussian Jewish anthropology professor from Columbia University, turned the social sciences into a form of ethnic warfare. Arguments from anthropology, no matter how absurd, could then be marshaled as "scientific" refutation of restrictionist immigration policies:

> Carl Degler notes that Boas's professional correspondence "reveals that an important motive behind his famous head-measuring project in 1910 was his strong personal interest in keeping America diverse in population." The study, whose conclusions were placed into the Congressional Record by Representative Emanuel Celler during the debate on immigration restriction . . . concluded that the environmental difference consequent to immigration caused differences in head shape.

The battle over multiculturalism continued unabated after World War II. Senator Pat McCarran, a Catholic from Arizona, was subjected to psychoanalysis on the pages of *Commentary* magazine, published by the American Jewish Committee, as a way of explaining his opposition to the progressive Jewish view on immigration. As before the war, the opposition to McCarran's bill—which became the McCarran-Walter act—"was led by Jewish members of Congress, including Celler, Javits and Lehman, all of whom . . . were prominent members of the ADL."

There is a direct link between Jewish anthropology as practiced by Franz Boas during the 1920s and Jewish immigration policy as implemented by Senator Jacob Javits in 1965. In other words, if New York City resembles Mogadishu these days, we have Dorothy Rabinowitz and her co-religionists to thank for this. The main reason people like Major Hasan are American citizens and serving in the United States Army is the immigration bill of 1965, which was a Jewish operation from start to finish. The Jewish organizations that promoted multiculturalism all shared the view of America proposed by Philip Roth in his paranoid fantasy novel *The Plot Against America*. America, in spite of waging war on Hitler's Third Reich, was always in Jewish eyes a country waiting to be taken over by Nazi extremists. Multiculturalism was the Jewish way of ensuring that that would not happen. As MacDonald points out:

> Earl Raab . . . remarks very positively on the success of revised American foreign policy in altering the ethnic composition of the United States since 1965. Raab notes that the Jewish community has taken a leadership role in changing the Northwestern European bias of American immigration policy, and he has also maintained that one fact inhibiting anti-Semitism in the contemporary US is "an increasing ethnic heterogeneity as a result of immigration, has made it even more difficult for a political party or mass movement of bigotry to develop." Or more colorfully: "The Census Bureau has just reported that about half of the American population will soon be non-white or non-European. And they will all be American citizens. We have tipped beyond the point where a Nazi-Aryan party will be able to prevail in this country." . . . Indeed the "primary objective" of Jewish political activity after 1945 "was . . . to prevent the emergence of an anti-Semitic reactionary mass movement in the United States."

Charles Silberman notes that

> American Jews are committed to cultural tolerance because of their belief that Jews are safe only in a society acceptant of a wide range of attitudes and behaviors, as well as a diversity of religious and ethnic groups. It is this belief, for example, not approval of homosexuality, that leads an overwhelming majority of American Jews to endorse 'gay rights' and to take a liberal stand on most other so-called 'social' issues.

Silberman's testimony leads MacDonald to conclude that:

> The 1965 law is having the effect that it seems reasonable to suppose had been intended by its Jewish advocates all along: the Census Bureau projects that by the year 2050, European-derived peoples will no longer be a majority of the population of America. Moreover, multiculturalism has already become a powerful ideological and political reality.

In promoting their multicultural agenda, the Jews claimed that it would lead to collaboration and brotherhood. Writers like Boas protégé Israel Ehrenberg, who wrote under the name of Ashley Montagu, claimed that human beings were "innately cooperative." Any evidence that increasing ethnic diversity led to ethnic conflict, i.e., violence, was ignored by the Boasian social science establishment, which had an *a priori* and overriding commitment to Jewish universalism. Conflict and violence, however, were inevitable, especially since the dominant philosophy of post-Christian America was then and is now Capitalism, which is the economic version of the war of all against all:

> If one adopts a cultural pluralism model in which there is free competition for resources and reproductive success, difference between ethnic groups are inevitable, and history suggests that such differences would result in animosity from the groups that are losing out. . . . Under present policies, each racial/ethnic group in the world is encouraged to press its interest in expanding its demographic and political presence in America and can be expected to do so if given the opportunity.

According to MacDonald, the American Jewish Committee, the primary proponent of both multiculturalism and unrestricted immigration, succeeded in changing the ethnic make up of the United States through "strong leadership [particularly Louis Marshall], internal cohesion, well-funded programs, sophisticated lobbying techniques, well-chosen non-Jewish allies and good timing."

If timing is everything, the timing was all wrong in Rabinowitz's attack on the connection between Major Hasan, Islam and multiculturalism. On the one hand, Islam was changing the political face of the Middle East through non-violent, pro-democracy rallies. Egypt had just toppled its dictator in a bloodless revolution. (Paradoxically, the same pro-democracy forces that neocons like Rabinowitz had promoted as agents of change in the Middle East were finally having their day, and the neocons were upset that being pro-democracy in the Middle East means invariably being anti-Israel.) On the other hand, at the very moment when the Islamic world was becoming a paradigm of non-violent democratic revolution of the sort that the neocons claimed they desired in the mid-East, Americans were treated to a spate of mass murders perpetrated by Jews.

That you may not have noticed this is not surprising. Ever since the Leo Frank trial in America, the Dreyfus case in France, and the Mendil Beilis case in Russia, the Jewish-dominated press has adopted a policy of suppressing the evidence whenever a suspect in a crime is a Jew and accusing anyone who brings up this fact of anti-Semitism. In addition, the Jewish dominated media work for the exoneration of any Jew brought to trial. The pattern had already been established in the 19th century. Once Jews gained significant control over the press, they instituted a policy which suppressed the identification of Jews

as criminals, or as a fallback position, once the Jewishness of the perpetrator was inescapable, of proclaiming the suspect as an innocent victim of anti-Semitism. The trial of Leo Frank is a good case in point, and it has served as a template for the Jewish press ever since. As one writer put it in 1892:

> It is a strange phenomenon which otherwise is evident in no other religious group that the Jewish public opinion in the Austrian press always shows solidarity with Jewish criminals. Every time a Jew is convicted of a crime, it is taken as new proof for pervasive anti-Semitism. Every conviction is evidence of anti-Semitism.[3]

JEWISH MASS MURDERERS

Dorothy Rabinowitz could have bolstered her case against multiculturalism if she had cited the story of Maksim Gelman. One week before her article appeared in the *Wall Street Journal*, Maksim Gelman, a recent Ukrainian immigrant, who became an American citizen in 2005, went on a two-day killing spree from February 11 to February 12, 2011, which resulted in the stabbing deaths of four people, including his girlfriend's mother, and the wounding of five others. The only problem in this scenario, at least from Rabinowitz's point of view, is that Gelman is a Jew. He was certainly a product of Jewish-inspired multiculturalism which opened this country's borders in 1965, but it is unlikely that he was inspired by jihadism, especially since his father drove an ambulance for a Jewish organization. If Rabinowitz were interested in understanding the psychology of mass murderers, she should have focused on the Jews because it was they who were making the news as mass murderers in early 2011, not the Muslims.

The story of Jared Loughner is another case. Roughly one month before Maksim Gelman's homocidal rampage in New York, on January 8, 2011, Loughner went on a shooting spree that resulted in the death of six people and left 14 wounded. One of the people whom Loughner shot but did not kill was United States Representative Gabrielle Giffords, who is Jewish. The response to the killings was predictable and immediate. Loughner was accused of being a right-wing anti-Semite whose actions had been set in motion by right-wing talk radio and politicians like Sara Palin, whose website featured a picture of Giffords in the cross hairs of a gun sight. The hate crime story circulated widely until the facts started to emerge. Loughner, it turns out, was a Jew himself. In fact, according to some reports, he was a member of the same synagogue that Giffords attended. To make matters more complicated, his favorite book was *Mein Kampf*. Loughner was, in other words, a Jewish Nazi. According to the *Jewish Telegraph Agency*:

> Bryce Tierney, a friend of Loughner from high school, told *Mother Jones* magazine that the alleged gunman posted "Mein Kampf" as a "favorite

> book" on a social media site in part to provoke his mother, who Tierney says is Jewish.

Once it became apparent that Loughner was Jewish, and once it had become clear that it was going to be impossible to maintain the right-wing, anti-Semite story line, the story began to change. The ADL then released an "analysis of the messages written by Arizona shooting suspect Jared Lee Loughner" which "revealed Wednesday that the he may not have been motivated by anti-Semitism when shooting Congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords, but rather by a profound mistrust of government."

"While there is still much we don't know about Loughner, his online footprint offers one window into his mindset in the months leading up to the killings," said Abraham H. Foxman, ADL National Director. "The writings that have come to light so far suggest someone who probably was not associated with any extremist group or movement, but who has a generic distrust of government and a vague interest in conspiracy theories."

In other words, the ADL was telling us that the fact that *Mein Kampf* was Loughner's favorite book had nothing to do with his attempted assassination of a Jewish member of Congress. The only way this makes sense is if we look at the pattern of Jewish organizations and newspapers, who exonerate automatically any suspect who happens to be Jewish. But even granting that, it's probably just as accurate to say that the concept of a Jewish Nazi is simply too difficult for the media to process.

The historic precedent of Jewish Nazis assassinating Jewish politicians, however, has already been established, no matter how alien it seems to 21st American media categories. Anton Graf von Arco auf Valley was a Jewish Nazi in the most literal sense of the term. In February 1919, he assassinated Kurt Eisner, the Jewish premier of the Bavarian Soviet Republic. Arco Valley had served in the German army during World War I and upon his return to civilian life in Munich he was appalled at what he saw as the Jewish influence which took over German culture in the wake of Germany's defeat. Some speculate that he decided to kill Eisner to prove himself to his nationalist friends in the Thule Society, but the mystery remains. Why would a Jew other than Groucho Marx want to be part of an organization that would not accept him as a member? Politics may have had something to do with it. Arco Valley is reported to have said that "Eisner is a Bolshevist, a Jew; he isn't German; he doesn't feel German; he subverts all patriotic thoughts and feelings. He is a traitor to this land."[4] Once Arco Valley killed Eisner, the students at the university which he was attending proclaimed him a hero. Hitler was grateful to his Jewish supporter because Eisner's death led to the creation of the Bavarian Soviet Republic, under another Jew, Eugen Levine, and this convinced groups like the Bavarian Freikorps that things had gone too far and caused them to intervene and put an end to the Communist, i.e,

Jewish takeover of Bavaria. Arco Valley was sentenced to death for his crime, but a sympathetic judge overturned the ruling and commuted it to a five-year prison sentence. Four years into his sentence, he was evicted from his cell to make room for Adolf Hitler, who wrote *Mein Kampf* during his stay there.

Jewish mass murderers remain invisible in America in the 21st century because the concept of the hate crime was created with a political purpose in mind. Murder was already a crime in every state in the union; hate crimes were created to demonize a certain group of people. As a result, the hate crime became a self-fulfilling prophecy because it is only applied when the perpetrator fit a certain profile. As the late Tom Herron pointed out in these pages, the Jew who deliberately set fire to the Church of the Little Flower in Royal Oak, Michigan as retaliation against Father Coughlin, could not be construed as the perpetrator of a hate crime because he was Jewish.

Needless to say, the Rabinowitz theory that mass murders came about when jihadism mixed with multiculturalism was looking less plausible by the minute. On February 10, 2010, one year before Rabinowitz discovered the key to mass murder in a combination of jihadism and multiculturalism, a white professor walked into a faculty meeting of the biology department at the University of Alabama in Huntsville and murdered the African-American department chairman and other persons of color in the department. This would seem to constitute the quintessential hate crime. That's how the media would have played the story had they not discovered that the mass murderer was a woman and Jewish. Once those facts were established, the story, deprived of its political usefulness, disappeared from the headlines.

Amy Bishop, the Jewish lady who gunned down her Black department chairman, had murdered her brother a few years earlier but had never been prosecuted because her parents were wealthy members of powerful Jewish organizations. Once it becomes apparent that a mass murderer is Jewish the story changes dramatically. Suddenly, we are out of the realm of hate crime and into the realm of dynamic silence, or back to the '60s therapy explanation of why basically good people do bad things when under stress because they have not been granted tenure, etc.

PRO-LIFE JEW

Just as Bernard Nathanson found that he ceased to exist as a person in the public record when he became a Jew who opposed abortion (there is no such thing as a pro-life Jew according to the categories of the *New York Times*), there is no such thing as a Jewish Nazi or a Jewish mass murderer. The category simply doesn't exist.

Unless you read Israel Shahak and Mershinzky's account of Baruch Goldstein, yet another Jewish mass murderer, and how he murdered 29 people, including children, at the Patriarch's cave in Hebron on February 25,

1994. Goldstein was born into an Orthodox Jewish family in Brooklyn, where he attended the Yeshivah of Flatbush, Yeshiva University and Albert Einstein College of Medicine. One of Goldstein's boyhood friends was Rabbi Meir Kahane, founder of the Jewish Defense League, and unsurprisingly Goldstein joined that organization.

Goldstein emigrated to Israel in 1983 and served as a physician in the Israeli Defense Force, where he refused to treat Arabs, even if they were members of the IDF. The IDF ignored his disobedience of a direct order and sheltered him instead of punishing him until the day he died at the hands of the Palestinians he had failed to kill in his attack.

According to the *Wikipedia* entry under his name, "Goldstein was immediately denounced with shocked horror even by the mainstream Orthodox,' and most in Israel classified Goldstein as insane." Israel Shakak tells a different story in his book *Jewish Fundamentalism in Israel*, which documents Goldstein's apotheosis as a Jewish saint, complete with monument and pilgrimages to his gravesite. The canonization procedures started at Goldstein's funeral when Rabbi Yaacov Perrin announced that the lives of one million Arabs were "not worth a single Jewish fingernail." Goldstein had become a Jewish saint because he was a Jewish mass murderer:

> While the government seemed determined to play down the magnitude of the massacre, the Jewish masses had turned Goldstein into a saint. . . . In 2010, Jewish settlers were criticized that during celebrations of Purim they sang songs praising Baruch Goldstein's massacre demonstratively in front of their Arab neighbours. A phrase from the song reads "Dr. Goldstein, there is none other like you in the world. Dr. Goldstein, we all love you . . . he aimed at terrorists' heads, squeezed the trigger hard, and shot bullets, and shot, and shot."

According to Shahak, "Goldstein's behavior had deep roots in the Jewish religion, and that religion had a profound influence on political culture in Israel." The connection between Goldstein's act of mass murder and the Jewish religion lay in the halachic teaching that "the killing by a Jew of a non-Jew under any circumstances is not regarded as murder." Hence, in the ensuing discussion, the terms "murder," "massacre" or "killing" were avoided; instead the terms used were "deed," "event" or "occurrence."

The fact that "at least 50 percent of Israeli Jews" approved of the massacre led Katz to claim that "the most obvious conclusion" is that "we, the Jews . . . have been programmed by the same racist computer program that is shaping the majority of the world's nations."

Katz's mention of Jewish racism then led to a discussion of Jewish Nazism. Goldstein was a Jewish Nazi because, unlike Christians who believed in conversion of the Jews, he, like Hitler and Goebbels, believed in exterminating his enemies because of ineradicable racial characteristics. The esteemed Israeli

journalist Teddy Preus made the Jewish-Nazi connections in an article which appeared in *Davar* on March 4, 1994:

> Compared to the giant-scale mass murderers of Auschwitz, Goldstein was certainly a petty murderer. His recorded statements and those of his comrades, however, prove that they were perfectly willing to exterminate at least two million Palestinians at an opportune moment. This makes Dr. Goldstein comparable to Dr. Mengele; the same holds true for anyone saying that he [or she] would welcome more of such Purim holiday celebrations. [The massacre occurred on that holiday.] Let us not devalue Goldstein by comparing him with an inquisitor or a Muslim Jihad fighter. Whenever an infidel was ready to convert to either Christianity or Islam, an inquisitor or Muslim Jihad fighter would, as a rule, spare his life. Goldstein and his admirers are not interested in converting Arabs to Judaism. As their statements abundantly testify, they see the Arabs as nothing more than disease-spreading rats, lice or other loathsome creatures; this is exactly how the Nazis believed that the Aryan race alone had laudable qualities that were inheritable but that could become polluted by sheer contact with dirty and morbid Jews. [JDL founder Meir] Kahane, who learned nothing from the Nuremberg Laws, had exactly the same notions about the Arabs.

Shahak and Mershinzky conclude their book with a condemnation of "those who are silent and do not condemn Jewish Nazism, as exemplified by the ideologies of Goldstein and Ginsburgh, especially if they are Jews, [because they] are guilty of the terrible consequences that may yet develop as a result of their silence."

THE BELIEVER

Seven years after Baruch Goldstein murdered 29 Palestinians in the cave of the patriarch in Hebron, and less than five years after Shahak and Mezvinsky explained how Goldstein was a Jewish Nazi, *The Believer*, a film written and directed by Henry Bean about an orthodox Jew who becomes a neo-Nazi won the Grand Jury Prize at the 2001 Sundance film festival. The film is based loosely on the life of Daniel Burros, a neo-Nazi who committed suicide in the mid-'60s after a *New York Times* reporter wrote an article exposing him as a Jew. According to Bean:

> Burros was staying at a camp in the Poconos with the neo-Nazis when the story in the *New York Times* claiming that he was Jewish came out. The Nazis weren't upset. They were saying just sit down; we can talk about this. But Burros went up to his room, put on a Wagner record and shot himself. He killed himself within an hour of the story coming out.

Bean began discussing the Danny Burros story in the '70s when he was a writer living on the West Coast. He began to see Burros as typifying a particular kind of Jew. "He was a rabbi manque. Antisemitism is a form of practicing Judaism. He's sort of a rabbi after all. A Jew by day, a Nazi by night. . . . He was desperately hiding something and compulsively trying to bring it out at the same time. People are drawn to contradiction. He undergoes a conversion, but not back to the Torah." By telling the story of the Jewish Nazi, Bean concluded, "I began to understand what Judaism was."

When Danny Balint, the character Bean created out of the story of Danny Burros, gets a call from a *New York Times* reporter, he gives an eloquent articulation of anti-Semitism. Judaism "is a sickness. . . . The real Jew is a nomad and a wanderer. He has no roots and no attachments. He universalizes everything. All he can do is buy and sell and manipulate markets. It's all mental. Marx, Freud, Einstein: what have they given us? Communism, infantile sexuality and the atom bomb. They want nothing but nothingness, nothing without end."

The main issue in *The Believer* of how a Jew can become a Nazi is theological. Danny has penetrated to the heart of the Jewish religion by understanding that the Jew worships Nothingness. If Hitler is the biggest nihilist of the 20th century, he is the chief rabbi in the religion that worships "nothing but nothingness, nothing without end." He attained that position by default when the Church stopped working for the conversion of the Jews. Through a series of flashbacks, the viewer sees Danny Balint arguing with his Yeshiva teacher about whether Abraham spared Isaac's life, as recounted in the Genesis account, or whether, as Danny maintains, he died on Mt. Moriah. Danny's problems with religion stem from the fact that he takes the Torah much more seriously and literally than his fellow Yeshiva *bokkers*. When one of them tells Danny that "Fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom," he becomes rhapsodic: "Fear of the Lord," he responds, "makes you afraid of everything. Do you even believe in God? I'm the only one who does believe. I see Him for the power-drunk madman that he is. And we're supposed to worship such a deity? I say never."

At this point the teacher tells one of the students "to ask Rabbi Singer to remove Danny from my class," which prompts Danny to turn his eyes upward and say to God, "Then let Him destroy me now. Let Him destroy me like the conceited bully that He is. Go ahead."

Like Jared Loughner, Danny Balint is a Jew who has read *Mein Kampf* and thinks it's a great book. "Did you ever read *Mein Kampf*?" Danny asks his fellow skinheads when they end up in jail after a fight with two Blacks. "Hitler had some of his best ideas in prison." Danny admires Hitler, especially his views on race. In the middle of a meeting of more moderate right-wingers at an upscale Manhattan apartment, Danny, who is wearing a red T-shirt emblazoned with a black swastika, interrupts the speaker to opine that "race

is central to everything we're talking about tonight. Race is the source of religion." When the speaker objects that this would mean "Germany all over again." Danny responds by saying, "Isn't that what we want? Germany all over again but done right this time?"

When Danny gets a call from a *New York Times* reporter, he gives the eloquent articulation of anti-Semitism. And he concludes, the Jews "want nothing but nothingness, nothing without end."

The *Times* reporter is impressed, but as we have come to expect from reporters, at the moment when the real issue is framed, the reporter changes the subject. "Wow," he tells Danny, "You're incredibly articulate, but how can you believe all this when you're a Jew yourself?"

When confronted by the contradiction at the heart of his identity, Danny becomes violent. At first he denies he's Jewish, then he threatens to sue the *Times* if the reporter publishes the article: "It's reckless disregard. I'm going to sue your fucking Jew paper." Finally, he takes out a gun and puts it into the mouth of the reporter and announces, as if unaware of the contradiction: "If you publish that article, I will kill myself."

All of the themes we have been discussing—Jews, racism, Nazism, nihilism, and violence—are present in this powerful scene. At this point, they begin to coalesce into a coherent picture. The Jewish Nazi is a political terrorist, but he is, first of all, a Nazi, which is to say a particular kind of socialist. Jews were drawn to socialism and communism throughout the 19th century. In fact, Jews made up the backbone of those movements. Jews were drawn to those movements because they provided both an antidote and a way to give political expression to the Jewish nihilism which came into being when the Enlightenment arrived in the *shtetl* and destroyed rabbinic Judaism. Deprived of a coherent worldview, the Jew still had a sense of himself as a member of the chosen race which could now only find expression in revolutionary violence. The best way for the *shtetl* Jew to bring about *tikkun olan* was via dynamite and the Colt revolver.

Because Danny lives in an age in which socialism has failed, he is unsure of how to focus the revolutionary violence that is going to deliver him from the strong pull toward non-being which Jewish nihilism creates. Should he kill the reporter from the Jew newspaper or should he kill himself? Actually, the question needs to be reframed in light of what Danny actually said, namely, "If you publish that article, I will kill myself." Should Danny the Nazi kill Danny the Jew? In a fantasy he picked up after hearing a holocaust survivor describe how a Nazi soldier killed his son, Danny plays the role of both Jew and Nazi soldier.

JUDAISM IS NIHILISTIC

Judaism, according to the theology proposed by *The Believer*, is essentially nihilistic. The Jews "want nothing but nothingness, nothing without end." This theme gets developed throughout the film. When Danny's girlfriend asks him to explain the difference between God's apophatic character and "Him not existing at all," Danny replies, "there is no difference." When she tells him that "Christianity's silly but at least there's something to believe in," Danny responds, "Judaism is nothing. Nothing but nothingness." Then as if reconsidering the issue, Danny says, "Judaism isn't really about belief. It's about doing things."

"And belief follows?" his girlfriend asks.

"Nothing follows."

Eventually his girlfriend catches on. After setting out a seder meal for Danny, she says he should sit down and take part in the meal because God "commands it whether he exists or not."

Like Jacob, Danny's girlfriend concludes that there is no point in fighting God. "We can fight Him and be crushed. Or we can submit."

"And be crushed," says Danny.

After their rejection of Christ, the Jews confected a religion based on the absence of Logos, which is to say, the absence of Being, which is to say, nothing. If the Eucharist in the tabernacle in the Catholic Church can be termed "the Real Presence," then what the Jew who rejected Christ worships in his synagogue can be termed "the real absence," which is another word for nothing. The Jew worships nothing; or better, the Jew worships nothingness. The Jew, as Jacques Derrida has pointed out *malgre lui* but amply in his deconstructive literary criticism, is obsessed with the absence of presence or the presence of absence.

Nihilism leads inevitably to violence because violence, which is a manifestation of the arbitrary and autonomous will, is the only way that the acting person can assert his existence in a world without Logos. Violence is an extreme form of self-assertion, and only extreme forms of assertion are powerful enough to prevent the slide into non-being to which the Jewish nihilist is exposed by the very fact that he is Jewish. That is so because Jews worship the absence of being and as a result "want nothing but nothingness, nothing without end." Judaism is about doing things because nihilism is ultimately about doing things, because action is the only thing that prevents dissolution into non-being in a universe based on nothingness.

Nihilism, in other words, leads inevitably to violence. So to get back to the plot of *The Believer*, when Danny goes to a Jewish bookstore, he meets one of his former Yeshiva classmates, who invites him to the synagogue for services—the same synagogue, it turns out, where Danny planted a bomb, which failed to go off. This time he plants another bomb, timed to go off

during Sabbath services, at which he decides to read the Torah. When Danny goes to the synagogue, he meets one of his former Yeshiva classmates, who calls him a "Jewish Nazi." By showing up to davin at the synagogue where he has planted a bomb, Danny the Nazi finally succeeds in killing Danny the Jew. But since he dies reciting the Torah, it is equally accurate to say that Danny the Jew ends up killing Danny the Nazi.

At the end of the film, after Danny blows up the synagogue in which he is praying, we next see him running up a flight of stairs at the Yeshiva. At the top of one flight, Danny sees his former teacher, who now agrees with Danny, claiming that "Isaac died on Mt. Moriah and was reborn in the world to come," but Danny runs past him up yet another flight of steps, causing the teacher to ask, "Danny, where are you going. Don't you know? There's nothing up there."

Jewish nihilism, in other words, leads to Jewish violence.

JEWISH NIHILISM IN NINETEENTH CENTURY RUSSIA

Russia was plagued by nihilism and the violence which it inevitably spawned throughout the 19th century. This was nowhere more evident than in the Jewish *shtetls* which dotted the Pale of the Settlement which made up Russia's predominantly Jewish border with the West during the 19th and early 20th centuries. After centuries of rabbinic despotism, Jewish nihilism became too obvious to ignore, about when the German Enlightenment came in contact with the Talmudic culture of the *shtetl* and destroyed it by showing its futility and intellectual obsolescence. The *shtetl* Jew was released from his bondage to the rabbis and the kahal, the Jewish courts which enforced Talmudic nihilist culture, but without being granted access to the Logos which made Christian Europe and hence the Enlightenment (by way of reaction, of course) possible. Using the Enlightenment to split the Talmudic atom released enormous amounts of destructive energy, energy which eventually destroyed Russia itself in 1917.

In his magisterial treatment of Jews and revolution in 19th century Russia, Erich Haberer claims that "Nihilism was the most spontaneous and radical expression of the Russian renascence of the 1860s. Essentially, it was a 'cultural revolution' of the young generation against the existing order":[5]

> Convinced that their native culture was an anachronism that was kept alive by an equally anarchistic surrounding society, these men were rebels without firm social and/or national moorings in either the Jewish or Russian world. They were strangers who, like all men cast adrift on a turbulent sea, sought security by boarding and helping to navigate any ship which would sail into the sunrise. The only vessel that came into sight and took them aboard as full members of the crew, sailed under the flag of revolution. Here they found brotherhood, recognition, and

> a place they could call their own; here they regained a sense of identity, of belonging and fulfillment, that they had sought desperately in so far as they ceased to identify with their Jewishness. Cut off from their original sources of Jewish existence, they planted – or rather replanted – themselves firmly on the deck of this life-saving vessel which promised a safe, albeit stormy, journey to the promised land. Succinctly put, their cosmopolitanism was really the obverse side of Jewishness – a search for identity that was predicated on their estrangement from the community in which they were raised and which had shaped their spiritual being. Hence the religious-existential nature of their identification with socialism and its Russian 'church' – the revolutionary movement.

If the Enlightenment could overturn a Logos-based culture like Catholic France in a matter of decades, it is not difficult to imagine the devastating effect that it would have on a fragile anti-Logos culture like the Talmudic *shtetl*. We are still experiencing the fallout from the explosion that destroyed the *shtetl*. *The Believer*, as well as the phenomenon of the Jewish Nazi which it describes, is part of that ongoing cultural fallout.

Nihilism in Russia, including the writings of Nikolai Chernyshevksy, "the Russian 'philosophe' par excellence," was based on the French Enlightenment. As in France, the Haskalah or Jewish Enlightenment called for "the destruction of all authority" and "the ridiculing of all *res sacrae*."[6] If the 1860s in Russia were a preview of what the 1960s were going to be in the West, it was largely because of Chernyshevsky's novel *What is to Be Done? The Tales of the New People* (Lenin later appropriated the title *Shto Delat?* for his famous revolutionary pamphlet.) The main characters of the novel, Vera Pavlovna and Pavel Rahkmetov became role models for the youth of the 1860s by espousing free love and a primitive vaguely religious sounding communism.

If the past century and a half has shown anything, it has shown how vulnerable the Logos-based West has been to the weaponizing of sexuality and the secularization of the Gospel that people like Chernyshevsky were proposing. If Catholicism in the West, strengthened by Scholasticism's appropriation of Greek philosophy in the Middle Ages proved to be no match for the Enlightenment, then it's not difficult to see that an essentially xenophobic anti-intellectual Russian orthodoxy was going to fail even more spectacularly. Similarly, if the weaponizing of sexuality and the secularization of the Gospel that people like Chernyshevsky were proposing devastated the West for the next century and a half, they were going to have an even more devastating effect on the culture of the *shtetl*, which had no Logos to defend itself. The result of this obliteration of *shtetl* culture was nihilism, or as Haberer puts it, "As a Philosophy of emancipation Russian nihilism can be viewed as an extension of the Jewish Enlightenment: it reinforced and radicalized its ideals of secular learning, self-improvement, and social responsibility."[7]

Nihilism took over the '60s generation in the *shtetl* even more rapidly and completely than it took over the mind of the Jews' Russian counterparts because the Logos of an anti-intellectual Christianity provided more resistance than the anti-Logos of the Talmud.

Nihilism had served them well in their maskilic, individualistic desire to emancipate themselves from their religious-traditionalist bound Jewish society. But it had left them frustrated, isolated, and marginal in trying to transform themselves and the Jewish people into universal citizens in the image of modern European culture. In socialism, regardless of its populist form, they discovered a philosophy of social action which was concerned with the collective rather than the individual, the "emotional" rather than the "rational," and "the people" rather than the "critically thinking" intelligentsia. While Aptekman's "Christian socialism" captures very well the underlying religious-existential motif of this shift to socialism, it is Akselrod who best exemplifies the Jewish radical's infatuation with the new grandiose perspectives of building "churches of the future" which would "conquer the whole world" and establish "universal brotherhood."

As a result, Jewish nihilism became a cultural movement that swept through the Pale of the Settlement spawning revolutionary violence in its wake. This crusade was led by Jewish gymnasium students and rabbinical seminarians who formed circles of self-education. These circles attracted the children of wealthy Jewish merchants, talmudists, and students of "Jewish crown schools."[8]

The anti-Logos of the Talmud found its natural fulfillment in the anti-Logos of revolution. And nihilism, which was the new term for anti-Logos, found expression in revolutionary violence. This trajectory is best explicated from the lives of the revolutionaries themselves. Before long the philosophy of nihilism gave birth to revolutionary organizations. The first "genuine revolutionary organization, the Society of Land and Freedom (*Zemlia i Volia*) came into existence in 1861. In 1864 Nikolai Ishutin and Dmitrii Karakazov created another revolutionary society known as "Organization." The terrorist arm of Organization was a "highly secretive inner group called 'Hell,'" which "stripped nihilism of its humanistic content by advocating unrestrained revolutionary violence."[9] From the mid-'60s onward, "ultra-extreme nihilists" like Karakazov, who "attempted to assassinate Alexander II on 4 April 1866" dominated radicalism in Russia. The fact that Karakazov was executed only "vindicated the terrorist legacy of the Ishutintsy and made Karakazov, who was promptly executed, a hero in the eyes of future generations of revolutionaries."[10]

Haberer claims that "only a small number of Jews were attracted to the revolutionary experiments of nihilist radicalism between 1856 and 1868" because nihilism—for the time being, at least—was "a cultural experience which, while contributing to their radicalization within a traditional Jewish

setting, was devoid of direct or immediate revolutionary implications." But that would change.

Before long the Russian revolutionary movement split into above ground essentially educational organizations like Chernyi Peredel, and underground terrorist organizations like *Narodnaia Volia*, which were dominated by Jews. The connection between Jews and revolutionary violence is not coincidental. In its initial phase, the Russian revolutionary movement pursued what would be viewed in retrospect as an essentially Romantic attempt on the part of Russian intellectuals to move to the countryside and live among the peasants, enlightening them about the true extent of their oppression at the hands of the Russian ruling class. In practical terms, this often took the form of revolutionary Jews preaching to orthodox Russian peasants. The peasants invariably perceived the Jews as foreigners espousing some alien, godless ideology, and more often than not the revolutionary proselytizing backfired when the peasants reported their would-be liberators to the local police. The failure of the Jewish participation in the *back to the land* movement led to a change in strategy. Jewish revolutionaries decided to concentrate on what they could do best as *praktiky*, i.e., organizers but especially, as *techniky*, which brought to bear their skills as printers, forgers, smugglers, counterfeiters, and technicians, particularly in their expertise in handling explosives.

OBVIOUS PRESENCE

As discussed in more detail in volume two, Hederer noted that that Jews were attracted to *Narodnaia Volia* because political terrorism was more congenial to Jewish participation than the theory and practice of traditional populism. The new political orientation and its urban-centered terrorist activity gave Jews an unprecedented opportunity that was much more conducive to their natural abilities and national characteristics. Their abilities of underground organization and technical know-how were readily appreciated and sought after by their Russian comrades. Psychologically, *Narodnaia Volia* gave Jews a political rationale for revolutionary action that was much more in tune with their experience than populist abstractions of social revolution.

Haberer's explanation of the Jews' attraction to revolutionary violence is good as far as it goes but it ignores the ontological connection between nihilism and violence. Jews were more attracted to violence because they came from a more nihilistic background. The Talmud had trained them to treat both the moral order and the *goyim* with contempt, and this dehumanization made it easier to kill people for a sacred cause. As Salo Baron has pointed out, Russians who ended up being interrogated by the Cheka, the Soviet secret police, after the revolution were more likely to be tortured by Jews because Jews did not view the *goyim* as fellow citizens. The Jews who had been taught as children to hold the *goyim* and their Christian moral law in contempt were

going to be less inhibited in engaging in violence and mayhem than their Christian counterparts. If the entire Jewish people could be sacrificed to the abstractions of the Talmud, it was only a short step to claim that *goyim* should be sacrificed to the revolutionary cause.

If we combine both internal and external reasons, it is easy to see why the revolutionary movement in Russia would become both more Jewish and more violent as the 19th century progressed. That progression is mirrored in the lives of the revolutionaries themselves. For Mark Natanson,

> nihilism proved to be an ideology of salvation. Having been sensitized from early on to the discrepancy between the reality and ideals of traditional Jewish society and beginning to lose, if not having already lost, faith in Judaism, he readily identified himself with the sort of 'nihilist personality' that emerged from Chernyshevsky's *What Is to Be Done?* and Pisarev's characterization of Bazarov – a person that would 'help cure society of its moral and physical ills by his exemplary life and useful work' and whose 'rational egoism was really a form of puritanism based upon the discipline of scientific work and a 'scientific' ethic. . . . The influence of nihilism and Jewishness in shaping Natanson's personality was also recognized by his contemporaries. Lev Deich and Osip Aptekman imply that, as in their own case, maskilic ideals and nihilist prescriptions contributed to Natanson's radicalization. Others have noted that while Natanson's practical and businesslike approach to revolutionary affairs was due to his upbringing in a Jewish merchant household, his intellectual perseverance bordering on dogmatism derived from his talmudic studies.[11]

Natanson's Jewishness made it more likely that his nihilism would find expression in violence rather than attempts to educate the benighted peasantry.

> The degree to which nihilism retained its hold on Natanson was . . . quite commonly replicated among Jewish intelligenty of the 1870s. In the person of Natanson, however, this translated itself politically into a concrete Jewish revolutionary contribution in the form of a programme that introduced a party-political dimension into an ostensibly apolitical Populist movement. Therefore, to put it succinctly, it was his Jewish background and Jewish-tinted nihilism which, in formulating the original programme of the future Chaikovtsy, made Natanson emphasize 'scientific rationalism' rather than romantic peasantism, political rather than social revolution, the intelligentsia rather than 'the people.'[12]

In 1875, Mark Natanson returned to St. Petersburg after four years of exile. In response to the disillusionment which police repression, peasant inertia and the xenophobic hostility of the masses had created in the revolutionary movement,[13] Natanson answered Chernyshevsky's question, "*Chto delat?*"

by building "a party of struggle." Because of the fear of being labeled anti-Semitic, scholars cannot address the issue of "'how and why' a Jew created Russia's first truly revolutionary party."[14]

One of the Jews attracted to Natanson's revolutionary party of struggle was Aron Zundelevich. In his novel *The Career of a Nihilist*, Sergei Kravchinskii has Zundelevich say that he loves the Nihilist more than he loves his fellow Jews:

> We Jews, we love our race, which is all we have on the earth. I love it deeply and warmly. Why should I love your peasants, who hate and illtreat my people with, blind barbarity, who tomorrow will perhaps loot the house of my father, an honorable working-man, and brutally assault him, as they have done to thousands of other poor hard-working Jews? I can pity your peasants for what but contempt can one feel for such wholesale cowards? No, there is nothing in your Russia worth caring for. But I knew the Nihilists, and I loved them even more than my own race. I joined and fraternized with them, and that is the only tie which binds me to your country. As soon as we have done with Your Tsar's despotism, I shall expatriate myself forever, and settle somewhere in Germany . . . Germany is the only land where we are not total strangers.[15]

The nihilist was the ultimate Jew, the apotheosis of the Jew, and if activity is the expression of essence, then the essence of nihilism was violent revolutionary action. Without action of this sort, nihilism becomes nothing more than non-being. The nihilist needs violent action to prevent the slide into nonexistence which his philosophy brings about as its ultimate telos. The more violent the action the better it acts as the antidote to non-being.

This probably explains Zundelevich's attraction to dynamite, a new form of explosive that became increasingly important in revolutionary circles during the latter part of the 19th century. Kravchinskii, who before becoming a novelist was a fellow nihilist and terrorist, "conducted experiments in the Swiss mountains to test the efficacy of dynamite and other explosives" at Zundelevich's behest.[16] Zundelevich told Kravchinskii that dynamite, out of which the nihilists fashioned "elegant and slender bombs," was the "most modern means available" to kill the Tsar and that it "corresponds best with the targets singled out for terrorist acts."[17]

Natanson attracted more and more Jews to the revolutionary movement, and Jews like Ginzburg, Epshtein, Finkelshtein and Zundelevich created an organization that mirrored their need for revolutionary violence rather than educating the peasantry:

> With Zundelevich's extensive underground organization at their disposal, the Natansonvtsy controlled a network of illegal border crossings which connected them via Berlin, Koenigsberg and Vilna with the two most important centres of Russian revolutionary printing activity abroad,

> London and Geneva. This line of communication and its central transfer points for goods and people was manned almost exclusively by Jews. In the border region between Koenigsberg and Vilna, Jewish smugglers – chief among them Zalman and his family – took care of the revolutionary ware, conveying it across the frontier by all sorts of ingenious enterprise." Particularly sensitive and valuable items such as printing press accessories and, later on, dynamite were taken directly to St Petersburg by Zalman himself and sometimes by Zundelevich. But generally the 'port of entry' was Vilna, which since the days of the first Vilna circle served as the main post once for 'red mail' to and from Russia.[18]

When Natanson visited Zundelevich in the fall of 1875 most of this underground infrastructure was already well in place. On June 11, 1876 Zundelevich and Natanson's organization attempted to murder the suspected agent-provocateur Nikolai E. Gorinovich by pouring sulphuric acid on his face. Gorinovich survived and provided the police with evidence about Zundelevich and Natanson's terrorist cell. In 1877 nihilism led to terrorism in the most literal sense of the term when Zundelevich and Natanson's organization murdered "the railroad worker N. F. Sharashkin for betraying Mark Natanson and a large number of workers associated with his so-called 'Society of Friends.'" As a result of the Gorinovich affair, "assassinations were increasingly viewed as an acceptable, even legitimate, weapon of revolutionary revenge and defense."

Soon the south of Russia was awash in terrorist attacks. The reason that "the virus of terror spread first in the south" of Russia is because of the overwhelmingly Jewish participation in the revolutionary movement there:

> The statistical findings of Kappeler (as they relate to Jews) show up in the presence of Jewish radicals in almost all "southern circles" which were directly or indirectly involved in acts of terrorism or physical resistance against the authorities. For instance, the Elizavetgrad circle of Lev I. Rozenfeld, which was closely linked with the Kiev Buntarists and helped them in organizing the Gorinovich assassination, consisted almost exclusively of Jews. The same was the case in Nikolaev where the "rebels" were in contact with, Solomon Vinenberg, Aron Cornbet, Lev and Savelii Zlaropolskii, all of whom were leading activists among the local, predominantly Jewish, radical youth. Indeed, Jews were a major and very active component in virtually all radical circles which in the south of Russia acted as catalysts of political terrorism.[19]

In the spring of 1878, Solomon Vittenberg returned to Nikolaev after a trip to Odessa in the south of Russia where terrorism was is full swing and announced that he was going to introduce a "new style" of terrorism by blowing up Tsar Alexander II's train with pyroxylin when it passed through Nidolaev on its way to St. Petersburg in August. Vittenberg was arrested on August 16, 1878,

when police discovered his address on someone sent from Odessa to assist in the assassination attempt, and hanged one year later. All of the conspirators in the Nikolaev plot to assassinate the Czar, but one, were Jewish.[20] According to Haberer,

> Scholars have justly cautioned against perceiving Judaism as a motivating force of Jewish radicalization. But to ignore or deny the workings of this religious dimension in the psychology of revolutionary Jews would be short-sighted. It prevents us from comprehending the mental processes which drove alienated men and existentially troubled individuals like Vittenberg to sanctify socialism and to commit themselves to terrorism.[21]

ENLIGHTENMENT LED TO NIHILISM

The revolutionary career of Grigorii Davidovich Goldenberg (1855-80) is another example of how the Enlightenment led to Nihilism and Nihilism to revolutionary violence. In 1865, Grigorii's parents moved out of the *shtetl* town of Berdichev to Kiev, where his father opened a successful hardware business. With success came assimilation, and with assimilation an end to the practice of Jewish culture and religion. All of the Goldenberg children were given a secular eduction, and all of them were as a result "caught up in the revolutionary movement."[22] Grigorii, the oldest and most talented, was the "first to fall victim to the siren call of revolution." On February 9, 1879, Grigorii entered the inner circle of the terrorist elite when he assassinated Prince Dimitri Kropotkin, Governor of Kharkov. One month later he was plotting the assassination Tsar Alexander II with the Zemlevoltsy of St. Petersburg:

> Goldenberg himself was a perfect, and timely, example for demonstrating the supposed truth that behind every terrorist plot there was a Jew. Here was a Jewish terrorist par excellence who had not only assassinated the Governor General of Kharkov, but who had advised others to kill the Tsar – a task, moreover, which he desired to execute himself. In addition, his written testimony was full of Jewish names implicating Jews like Aronchik and Zundelevich in terrorist activities. In the light of the previous arrest of Vittenberg and Jewish associates of his circle, including Gobet, all this merely confirmed the government's suspicion that Jews were principal agents of terrorism.

On March 1, 1881, *Narodnaia Volia* succeeded in assassinating Tsar Alexander II and the government began to see Jewish nihilism as the source of revolutionary activity in Russia.

> The ever growing Jewish participation in the revolutionary movement, and its increasing visibility as Jews became more frequently linked to highly publicized acts of terrorism, was duly registered by those who

> had least to gain from it – the government officials. Although some noticed that there was a nexus between the radicalization of Jews and *yiddishe rektlozikeyt*, the general feeling was that from time immemorial the 'Hebrew race' had been an alien and subversive element in society and that its decomposing powers had reached epidemic proportions due to the influx of Jews into Russian society via educational, professional, and commercial channels. This feeling gained in force as more and more Jewish names appeared conspicuously on the pages of government reports and newspaper articles dealing with political subversion in general and terrorist plots in particular.

A consensus was forming among the Russian elites. As a result of the Enlightenment, Jews had been "set free but not satisfied." The name for that unhappy state of affairs was Jewish nihilism. Jewish nihilism was the source of revolutionary violence in Russia. "To all the other good qualities which you Jews possess," the governor of Vilna told a group of Jewish leaders sarcastically in 1872, "about the only thing you need is to become nihilists too."[22a] Commenting on Mlodetskii's execution, *Novoe Vremia* opined that "these Jews, being from time immemorial the representatives of the revolutionary spirit, stand now at the head of Russian Nihilists."

Though highly prejudiced in its assertion that Jews, along with Poles, were the mainspring of the revolution, the tsarist government obviously had a case in blaming "Jewish nihilists" for the wave of terrorism that had rocked the ship of the state since 1878-79 and claimed its captain in 1881. In some ways, and in spite of their exaggerations, its officials had a more accurate appreciation of the role of Jews in the terrorist movement than the revolutionaries themselves or historians who joined them in downplaying the Jewish contribution.[23]

In spite of the crackdown following the assassination of the tsar in 1881, Jewish commitment to revolutionary violence intensified. In 1884 Shternberg wrote an influential pamphlet entitled "Political Terror in Russia," in which he advocated "systematic terrorism" including the "systematic killing of the tsar and the most important, the most outspoken enemies of the people and the intelligentsia." Terror, Shternberg concluded was "the only form of struggle possible against autocracy."

What they sought can best be described as an abstract and futuristic idealism of assimilation *qua* emancipation in a denationalized and secularized democratic society, ideally of universal scope. Leaving the world of their childhood did not necessarily imply its total abandonment in one act of irreversible forgetfulness. For many this departure under the sacred halo of socialism was the next best solution to their own existential problems.

Father Seraphim Rose, an American convert to Russian orthodoxy, dealt with these "existential problems" which led to and flowed from nihilism from an orthodox perspective. Rose claimed that "Violence is no merely incidental

aspect of the Nihilist Revolution, but a part of its essence." According to Marxist "dogma," "force is the midwife of every old society pregnant with a new one";[41] appeals to violence, and even a kind of ecstasy at the prospect of its use, abound in revolutionary literature. Bakunin invoked the "evil passions" and called for the unchaining of "popular anarchy" in the cause of "universal destruction," and his "Revolutionary Catechism" is the primer of ruthless violence; Marx was fervent in his advocacy of "revolutionary terror" as the one means of hastening the advent of Communism; Lenin defined the "dictatorship of the proletariat" as "a domination that is untrammeled by law and based on violence." "Demagogic incitement of the masses and the arousing of the basest passions for revolutionary purposes have long been standard Nihilist practice."

If metaphysics, which is the science of being *qua* being, can also be called "theology," then the root of nihilism, which was an attack on God *qua* being, had to be theological. Hence, Rose claims that nihilism is ultimately a "war against God." Nihilism prosecutes this war against being by a violent attack on Old Order. Political categories like right and left are irrelevant; both Bolshevism and Nazism grow out of nihilism and find their expression in violence:

> The most violent revolutionaries—a Nechayev or Bakunin, a Lenin or Hitler, and even the demented practitioners of the "propaganda of the deed"—dreamed of the "new order" their violent destructions of the Old Order would make possible; Dada and "anti-literature" seek not the total destruction of art, but the path to a "new" art; the passive Nihilist, in his "existential" apathy and despair, sustains life only by the vague hope that he may yet find some kind of ultimate satisfaction in a world that seems to deny it.[24]

Violence is inseparable from nihilism. Nihilism finds its fulfillment in violence. Bolshevism and National Socialism are equally violent forms of Nihilism. Both find their fulfillment in violence:

> Hitler's role in the Nihilist program was more specialized and provincial, but nonetheless essential. Even in failure – in fact, precisely in the failure of its ostensible aims – Nazism served the cause of this program. Quite apart from the political and ideological benefits which the Nazi interlude in European history gave to the Communist powers (Communism, it is now widely and erroneously believed, if evil in itself, still cannot be as evil as Nazism), Nazism had another, more obvious and direct, function. Goebbels explained this function in his radio broadcasts in the last days of the War.
>
> The bomb-terror spares the dwellings of neither rich nor poor; before the labor offices of total war the last class barriers have had to go down.

. . . Together with the monuments of culture there crumble also the last obstacles to the fulfillment of our revolutionary task. Now that everything is in ruins, we are forced to rebuild Europe. In the past, private possessions tied us to a bourgeois restraint. Now the bombs, instead of killing all Europeans, have only smashed the prison walls which kept them captive. . . . In trying to destroy Europe's future, the enemy has only succeeded in smashing its past; and with that, everything old and outworn has gone.

Nazism thus, and its war, have done for Central Europe (and less thoroughly, for Western Europe) what Bolshevism did in its Revolution for Russia: destroyed the Old Order, and thus cleared the way for the building of the "new." Bolshevism then had no difficulty in taking over where Nazism had left off, within a few years the whole of Central Europe had passed under the "dictatorship of the proletariat" – i.e., Bolshevist tyranny – for which Nazism had effectively prepared the way.

The Nihilism of Hitler was too pure, too unbalanced, to have more than a negative, preliminary role to play in the whole Nihilist program. Its role, like the role of the purely negative first phase of Bolshevism, is now finished, and the next stage belongs to a power possessing a more complete view of the whole Revolution, the Soviet power upon which Hitler bestowed, in effect, his inheritance in the words, "the future belongs solely to the stronger Eastern nation."

The thirty years of Nihilist war and revolution between 1914 and 1945 were an ideal breeding-ground for the "new human type." The new man was "deracinated" by the nihilist revolution. The old Christian civilization was destroyed by this 30 years war.

What, more realistically, is this "mutation," the "new man"? He is the rootless man) discontinuous with a past that Nihilism has destroyed, the raw material of every demagogue's dream; the "free-thinker" and skeptic, closed only to the truth but "open" to each new intellectual fashion because he himself has no intellectual foundation; the "seeker" after some "new revelation," ready to believe anything new because true faith has been annihilated in him; the planner and experimenter, worshipping "fact" because he has abandoned truth, seeing the world as a vast laboratory in which he is free to determine what is "possible"; the autonomous man, pretending to the humility of only asking his "rights," yet full of the pride that expects everything to be given him in a world where nothing is authoritatively forbidden; the man of the moment, without conscience or values and thus at the mercy of the strongest "stimulus"; the "rebel," hating all restraint and authority because he himself is his own and only god; the "mass man," this new barbarian, thoroughly "reduced and "simplified" and capable of only the most elementary ideas, yet scornful of anyone

> who presumes to point out the higher things or the real complexity of life.

As the foregoing passage makes clear, the new civilization which emerged from the ashes of World War II was Jewish. The new man was a Jew because only the deracinated could flourish in a world where the old order had been destroyed. Rose describes the post-World War II era and its culture as "the most concentrated era of Nihilism in human history." The war turned everyone into Jews by making Nihilism the world's regnant ideology. Yuri Slezkine, another Russian, noticed something similar in his book *The Jewish Century*:

> It is easy to dismiss as fantasy the "new humanity" foreseen by a Hitler or a Lenin; and even the plans of those quite respectable Nihilists among us today who calmly discuss the scientific breeding of a "biological superman," or project a utopia for "new men" to be developed by the narrowest "modern education" and a strict control of the mind, seem remote and only faintly ominous. But confronted with the actual image of a "new man," an image brutal and loathsome beyond imagination, and at the same time so unpremeditated, consistent, and widespread in contemporary art, one is caught up short, and the full horror of the contemporary state of man strikes one a blow one is not likely soon to forget.

Superman was created by two Jews in the '30s. So it should come as no surprise that the "Biological superman" is also a Jew. He has super DNA. Obsession with DNA among the deracinated was another sign that we had all become Jews in the wake of Nihilism's destruction of the old order.

DAVID COOPER

In *The Believer*, the Jewish Nazi gets a call from a *New York Times* reporter. In real life, the editor of *Culture Wars* gets a call from one of his subscribers, who praises *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* and then announces, "I'm a Jew, and I agree with everything you have written about the Jews." My Jewish admirer is not just a Jew but an anti-Semite as well, because, as he puts it at another point in our conversation, "Jews make the best anti-Semites."

In the winter of 1992 David Cooper was working as a painter in New York, when one of his colleagues asked if he would mind if he turned on the radio. What began as an interest in the Clarence Thomas hearings, ended up as a long-term commitment to listening to the local NPR station, whose orientation he described as totally Jewish. One afternoon, he remembers hearing a report on a drive-by shooting in Israel. They were in Brooklyn and drive-by shootings were commonplace there but never reported on, which led him to conclude that Jews control the media, and that controlling the flow

of information allows them to control the world. Exposing that control then became his mission in life.

David was born in 1966 in Manhattan, which he describes as "an expensive Jewish ghetto," into an intact family, but he soon became a casualty of the sexual revolution. He blames his mother for the destruction of their family.

> My dad was a doctor (GP) and my mom was the daughter of a wealthy judge. She was a virgin when she married my dad, but the '60s definitely impacted her. When I was three years old, she threw my dad out of the house. Dad then used that divorce to check out from normalcy. She became what some people would call a whore. She had three small children in the house and a new boyfriend every six months. I don't accept that kind of behavior. It's dissolute and amoral and typically Jewish.
>
> My dad created a new future for himself which involved sleeping around. My mom got into "law" after she threw my dad out. She started as a court reporter and retired as a lobbyist for SUNY Binghamton. In the meantime she ran a couple of bar associations; one was in New York, where she slept with half the lawyers (I jest). She [eventually] got out of running the bar because that was too many 'nasty Jewish kunts' even for her.

David claims that his childhood became a function of his mother's career as a lawyer and sexual libertine.

> We weren't raised religious. We were barely "raised" at all. We were left to our own devices and demise. The baby sitters were around just long enough 'til my older brother could "manage" us on his own, probably when I was like eight years old. I'm sure there was no babysitter after that.
>
> Our dad got us on Thursday nights and every other weekend. He did what he could, I guess. He tried to be a good dad, but he didn't really provide any moral compass. He just told us that if we ever rode a motorcycle we'd need to wear a helmet, and that if we wanted to be a doctor we couldn't marry. And he told me that if I ever got caught dealing drugs that he'd execute me, with a needle, on a table—a medical table of some sort, I imagine, a gurney, I guess.

David now claims that his parents' divorce had a devastating effect on everyone involved.

> It ruined my childhood and much of my adulthood. I'll probably never get over it. She sure didn't provide any moral compass. I couldn't keep track of all her boyfriends. They were around from my earliest memories. It was like a revolving door.
>
> When I was growing up, my best friends were typically Jewish, but I never viewed her as a Jew until I came to understand Jewish values. I can't

> really explain this. (I could try.) I didn't identify as such. Like attracts like I suppose. That may explain why probably half my best friends throughout my life have been Jews, and why I've dated countless Jewish women, at least a dozen that I've identified so far.

In 1978, when David was 11 years old, his mother moved him and his siblings to the Catskills. The move changed nothing. David's mother brought the hippie commune mentality she adopted when she divorced his father with her when she moved. Finding no guidance at home, David took a job at a restaurant shortly after arriving in the Catskills. By this point his siblings were starting to imitate his mother, which is to say, they were in his mind becoming "moral degenerates." Soon he found himself working for his brothers who were now in the restaurant business. He worked as a sales manager for his older brother's import business in New York but lost that job when the company went bankrupt because of embezzlement. His brother then built a restaurant which was a tremendous success until "he cheated someone else into buying it based on his famous bookkeeping. He is able to cook books so that anyone, including bank auditors, believe whatever he wants them to believe about the success of his business."

> My older brother is the least guilty of them all, but he has no moral standing in the world. His life is a lie. They all lie, to themselves and most everyone else about themselves. They all live lies. Their lives are lies. They are all morally repugnant. They are all so typically Jewish. There's not a moral bone between them all combined.

His experiences as a child left him full of anger and may have contributed to the alcoholism and substance abuse that he has battled for most of his adult life. Although David doesn't make the connection himself, it's difficult not to see his alcoholism as one of the *sequelae* of his parents' divorce.

> My life was totally dissolute, but I didn't live lies—not like they do. I lied to myself, but I didn't lie to others, besides the women when they asked me if I had a girlfriend or if I drank too much. I lied to women, about alcohol and other women, where I'd been and the like. I typically had a couple girlfriends at any given time, but these women really wanted to hear the lies.

David's mother threw him out of the house when he was 15. The issue was attendance at school. David claimed that he didn't have time for school since he was working full-time in the restaurant business. Finding himself homeless on the streets, he met "some old queer who took me in. He could hardly keep his hands off me, but I managed. I was his houseboy. I was his chauffeur. I was his handyman and his friend."

David became involved in music, but, given the circumstances in his life, that led to trouble too. In 1993 he got into a fight with a Negro who used a

baseball bat to rearrange David's facial features. $75,000 later his face is "still kind of lopsided," but not noticeably so. He has subsequently been assaulted by "a dozen African-Americans for being too white, I guess." Or maybe the brawls came about as a result of "being careless, like about where I was and stuff."

Through it all, David's family life has been a constant source of anger, which he projected onto the Jewish race. "Jews," he opined, "are the worst thing that happened to mankind, and the '60s revolution was a Jewish revolution." When I mention that he sounds a lot like Samuel Roth in *Jews Must Live*, David admits to having read the book and agreeing with Roth's negative take on the Jews. Roth earned a place in the Valhalla of Supreme Court decisions when he lost a landmark obscenity case. He earned literary immortality when he was excoriated in James Joyce's unreadable novel *Finnegans Wake* for having pirated an edition of *Ulysses*. Roth claims that he served time for an obscenity rap because a Jew lured him into sending obscene material through the mail. Roth then extrapolated from his unhappy experience to the Jewish race. "It dawned on me suddenly, blindingly," Roth wrote in a book which set out to prove "what a hideous swamp the Jews have made of Western Civilization," "that all the evils of my life had been perpetrated by Jews. . . . On every side I was being eaten alive by Jews."[25]

Some might call Roth a Jewish Nazi. "Do you believe a whole civilized nation would stand aside, witness what Hitler is doing to the Jews without a protest, unless there were real abuses on the part of the Jews which justified what is happening?"[26] Roth is aware of the contradiction but insists on the truth of the claim when he writes "I am myself a Jew, I know it. But I am a Jew who has been brought to the point where he so loathes his people that he thinks in terms of their destruction."[27]

The explanation of Roth's feeling is fairly straightforward. The main cause of anti-Semitism is Jewish behavior. "Anti-Semitism is the natural effect of such a social cause. I cannot understand why such a deep mystery is made of this simple cause." Since their behavior renders Jews, as St. Paul put it, "enemies of the whole human race,"[28] and since Jews have more contact with Jews than the *goyim*, and since they often bear the brunt of Jewish behavior, it is natural that a Jew would become an anti-Semite. It would be a stretch to call St. Paul a Jewish Nazi, but there are some Jews who might see him as the archetypal self-hating Jew. Whatever the case, his views are not that dissimilar from fellow Jew Roth, who writes, "We are a people of vultures living on the labor and the good nature of the rest of the world."[29] Roth cites Edward I, king of England, who expelled the Jews from that land in 1290 and in doing so set a precedent for other Christian lands. Roth puts the blame for these expulsions squarely on the shoulders of the Jews:

> Wherever they come they are welcomed, permitted to settle down, and join in the general business of the community. But one by one the industries of the country close to them because of unfair practices—until it being impossible to longer hold in check the wrath of a betrayed people, there is violence and, inevitably, an ignominious ejection of the whole race from the land. There is not a single instance when the Jews have not fully deserved the bitter fruit of the fury of their persecutors.[30]

David claims:

> Israel gets his *shabbas goy* to do his dirty work. Judah doesn't get his hands dirty unless he has to. Judah gets the *shabbas goy* to fight his wars for him. Israel called for Hitler's head on March 24, 1933. Twelve years and 48 days later, they got it. At what cost? Upwards of 70 million dead gentiles and well over 4 trillion american dollars. At what cost to Judah? How much did Judah's war on Hitler cost Judah? And what did Judah get from this war? He got Israel and much, much more.
>
> Back to the present. Why are we the sole superpower? How did it get to be this way? Of course we had no stake in either of those world wars. Nothing, but Israel dragged us into them, and she built a military empire using American tax dollars and men as their shabbas *goyim*. What is this vast military empire protecting? Not America. Judah has ruined us.

When he's not sounding like Samuel Roth, David sounds a lot like Danny Balint:

> Israel gave us communism, Lenin, and Stalin, and this all led from Israel's war on Germany to the cold war and Korea and Vietnam. This is all Israel's doing with her Judeo-communism. Multiculturalism is part of Judah's strategy to destroy us and to destroy western civilization. The Jews were behind the sexual revolution. Everything they did related to culture was a form of revolution.

In 2000, David discovered the writings of Professor Kevin MacDonald. As a result, David, like Danny Balint in *The Believer*, became convinced that race was central to understanding the human condition. In 2008, he was celebrating Thanksgiving with relatives when the topic of race came up. "Wouldn't it be great if we were Jewish?" he asked one of his cousins, who answered, "Well, as a matter of fact, we have many Jewish relatives."

David then went and had his DNA tested and discovered that he was a Jew. Which means, of course, that up until that time he wasn't a Jew. What was he then? David was baptized as a Catholic; as was his mother, as was his mother's mother. At this point the genealogy gets a bit misty, and it is at this point that the Jewish ancestors begin to appear on his family tree.

The phenomenon of suddenly discovering Jewish DNA in the family tree is not uncommon these days. The most famous example of this is Christopher

Hitchens. Hitchens sees Judaism as something racial. After discovering that one of his grandmothers was Jewish, he claimed that this helped him to understand why he had been a revolutionary for his entire life. The idea that Jewish revolutionary behavior is a function of Jewish DNA and is, therefore, ineradicable is an idea that Hitchens shares with Adolf Hitler, which brings us back once again to the Jewish Nazi theme.

Hitchens' brother Peter, who shares *ipso facto* the same genetic make-up, remains an Anglican, which is how both brothers were raised, and has apparently experienced a conversion away from revolutionary behavior, which he now associates with the *Zeitgeist* of the '60s and not his own DNA. As to Christopher's conversion and his subsequent atheism, Peter feels that it has more to do with his brother's sexual behavior, specifically his abandoning of his pregnant wife and taking up with a Jewish woman, rather than some irresistible urge emanating from his chromosomes, or the 12.5 percent of which he inherited from one of his grandmothers.

Christopher Hitchens' Judaism comes down to hatred of Christ and the Logos he embodies, a point which he made clear when he delivered the Daniel Pearl Memorial Lecture at UCLA on March 3, 2010:

> A real Christian, any serious believing Christian, would give everything he earned to have a personal meeting with Jesus of Nazareth. Nothing more could be desired than that. They yearn for it, they thirst for it, they hunger for it. No serious Moslem could want anything more than to have met himself with the messenger of God, with the prophet Mohammed. There were no Ukrainians around at that time. There were no Poles at the crucifixion. There were no Irish people in Mecca and Medina. There's only one people that stood around and met both of these imposters and said no, no sale, don't believe it. Do you think that's ever going to be forgiven? Of course it's not. Of course it will never be forgiven. They saw Jesus and they spat in his face. They saw the prophet Mohammed and they said, "this guy's just a warlord". And of Jesus they said "he's just a crackpot rabbi and also a great blasphemer," and Maimonides, in one of his sharper passages "our sages never did a better thing than when they got rid of that rabble-rousing imposter." Well, [it] makes you proud, I hope. You shouldn't want to be forgiven for getting a thing like that right. But don't go to any mushy ecumenical outreach meeting with these people. It's a waste of time.

Another even more unlikely example of someone discovering via DNA that he was Jewish is Minister Louis Farrakhan, who announced his Jewishness at a synagogue prayer service in Jamaica. This ongoing narrative of surprising conversions reached the level of parody in an issue of *Forward* that announced that Glenn Beck was really a Jew.

> Following the recent revelations that Glenn Beck (born Bekershteyn) shares the Jewish genetic marker, the Cohen Modal haplotype, he has been brushing up on his Yiddish and planning his holidays . . . Beck fiddled nervously with a red kabbalah thread around his wrist. "I guess I'd always had doubts," he mumbled.

The irony in David's conversion is almost as overpowering as the moral pleas bargaining and opportunism in the case of Christopher Hitchens' conversion. David became a Jew largely because of reading Kevin MacDonald. When he got his DNA test back and found that he was (probably)[31] a Sephardic Jew, David welcomed the results because "it gives me credibility. That's why I joined the synagogue. I needed the credibility. If you're not a Jew, you can't talk about the Jews. If you're not a Jew, you're going to be marginalized. Only Jews are authorized to discuss these subjects in public." As if to give the indisputable proof of what he just said, David cited the case of E. Michael Jones. "The greatest gift I have ever gotten is to learn that we were Jewish." And then to make matters even more confusing, David confides to me that "there are lots of Jews on our team."

Upon reflection, this is less surprising than it might seem. David's transformation from a baptized Catholic to a practicing Jew flows fairly logically from his engagement in MacDonald's writing. In an essay on anti-Semitism, MacDonald admits candidly:

> But the reality is that I greatly admire Jews as a group that has pursued its interests over thousands of years, while retaining its ethnic coherence and intensity of group commitment. There have been ups and downs in Jewish fortunes, to be sure; but their persistence, at times in the face of long odds, and their spectacular success at the present time are surely worthy of emulation.[32]

In the same essay, MacDonald claims: "The point is that Jewish elites have been hugely influential in advancing the interests of their people. This is surely a goal to emulate."[33]

MacDonald's involvement with the Jews dates back to his days at the University of Wisconsin when he was involved with radical politics. In his memoir *Commies*, Ron Radosh has documented how the largely Jewish Communist Party targeted the University of Wisconsin at Madison for takeover in the '60s. When MacDonald got swept up into New Left politics, he became involved in the sexual revolution, and because of that involvement, he ceased practicing the Catholic faith. Sociobiology then filled the vacuum which the abandoned Catholic faith left behind.[34]

As a result there are at least three competing Kevin MacDonalds out there, and the permutations involved in the differing positions which each MacDonald *persona* represents can lead to strange results, as when David decided to become a Jew.

There is Kevin MacDonald the scholar. This man does admirable research into Jewish influence on our culture. Then there is Kevin MacDonald the sociobiologist, who has to claim that Jews are racially superior because they, as a small minority constituting only around two percent of the population in the United States, have triumphed in the struggle for existence that is the crucible of all value. The Jews have taken control of all of this country's cultural choke points and now control American culture, and they have accomplished this in the face of overwhelming demographic odds.

SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST

Survival of the fittest is a preposterous tautology, but it is, nonetheless, the cornerstone of sociobiology. If it is true that only the fittest prevail in the struggle for existence, then the inescapable conclusion which we must draw is that the Jews are the master race, and that they deserve their position of pre-eminence because they earned it on the battleground of evolutionary conflict, which is the only arena of significance. The sociobiology crowd must conclude that Jews are racially and biologically superior because they have triumphed against all other ethnic groups, including ethnic groups much larger than their own, in the struggle for existence. End of story. *Non datur tertius.* It was this aspect of sociobiology that led David paradoxically to admire the Jews and to want to become one, even if deploring all the while their pernicious effect on society. After all, Kevin MacDonald, the sociobiologist, has written in response to John Derbyshire:

> Derbyshire complains about my statement that, "the human mind was not designed to seek truth but rather to attain evolutionary goals." I was merely expressing a principle of evolutionary biology that has been of fundamental importance since the revolution inaugurated by G. C. Williams and culminating in E. O. Wilson's synthesis: Organisms are not designed to communicate truthfully with the others but to persuade them – to manipulate them to serve their interests.

And this leads us to the third Kevin MacDonald, the lapsed Catholic who still retains the moral indignation which he learned from his religious training as a child. This *persona* leads MacDonald to impose moral judgements on the conclusions he has derived from sociobiology, even if they contradict his sociobiological premises. So the final conclusion—Jews have triumphed in the ethnic struggle for existence, but this is a bad thing—is an oxymoron based on a combination of two completely incompatible world-views, MacDonald's sociobiology and the residual moral consciousness which he retains as a lapsed Catholic.

GEORG RATZINGER

Catholicism as practiced in the wake of Vatican II was hardly an unclouded mirror of Catholic tradition or without its own inconsistencies and self-contradictions, but for those who dug hard enough, a coherent position on the Jews could still be mined from the deposit of faith and the writing of the evangelists and the Church fathers. As late as 1892, Georg Ratzinger, great uncle of Pope Benedict XVI, had not only carried the teaching of the Church on the Jews known as *Sicut Judaeis* non into the present, he had applied it to the economic crisis that was gripping Europe at the time:

> The great medieval popes Innocent III and Gregory IX as well as the ecclesial synods and councils felt themselves called to take legal measures against the excesses of the Jews. They protected the life and existence of the Jews, but only under certain specific conditions. The Jews had to recognize the Christian social order and had to submit themselves to it. Whatever they had appropriated through usury and exploitation, they had to pay back to their victims. They were not allowed to occupy the choke points in the culture; they were not allowed to employ Christian servants in their houses, and when it came to their clothing they had to wear the so-called Jew hat in order to be immediately recognizable as Jews. Jews were in no way allowed to undermine the Christian social order. Jews who defamed Christ or Christians were punished. They were not allowed to do business on Christian holidays . . . and were not allowed to make usurious loans. During Holy Week they had to remain in their homes. Jews couldn't live wherever they pleased, but were confined to specific districts. It was also forbidden to sell house or real estate to Jews, or to rent to them, was also forbidden, as was living under the same roof with Jews. Similarly, Jews were forbidden to hire Christian nursemaids, servants, or day laborers.

Traditional Catholicism provides the only coherent explanation of what came to be known in Georg Ratzinger's day as the Jewish question. The explanation is fairly simple. Following Napoleon's emancipation of the Jews, they took over the economies of one nation after another in Europe because of their sharp business practices. What Ratzinger calls "*Juedisches Erwerbsleben*" allowed them to cheat the Christian natives, who had been taught to work hard, be trusting, and love their neighbor.[35] Jewish immorality, in other words, gave the Jews an unfair economic advantage in Catholic countries:

> The emancipation of the Jews, whose views and concepts contradicted the laws and customs of the Christian nations, could not help but have a destructive and corrupting effect on the entire Christian society. . . . This fact alone explains why Jews are able to accumulate riches so quickly. . . . The example of moral corruption has a contagious effect, and that explains the corrupting effect of Jewish influence on commerce.

> It was an act of supreme foolishness when in the years following 1789 the necessary protections for the social order were lifted immediately and universally. Once this happened it was only a matter of time before the Jews with their attitude toward business and commerce would gain the upper hand. This was particularly the case among the benevolent peoples who made up the population of Catholic nations, who had all grown up and been raised. . . . Others fell into the hands of the usurers and in spite of their frugality could not extricate themselves from its tentacles. Just about everyone was impoverished; and only the Jews got rich.[36]

Ratzinger's book appeared in 1892, around the same time as *Rerum Novarum*, Pope Leo XIII's encyclical on the condition of the working classes, and the three-part series in *Civiltà Cattolica* which warned Catholics about "the voracious octopus of Judaism."[37] The anger at Jewish business practices had reached the boiling point:

> The situation of the lucrative professions is totally different. In a few years, riches are amassed but at the cost of others. This form of profit is obscene, and the hatred and revulsion which the working classes feel toward these practices is fully justified. Envy isn't the cause of this hatred, but rather indignation at the unjust appropriation of value, that and the perception that this unjust appropriation constitutes an assault on the foundations of social life, evokes in the breast of the honest working man, bitter feelings. When the industrious and skilled worker, the honest civil servant, and the circumspect merchant in spite of all out exertion can't earn a living, when on the other hand this or that speculator, without any effort, can earn thousands or hundreds of thousands through the issuing of government bonds, then this is a sign that the economic organism is so diseased that society is in urgent need of medicine and reform.[38]

Georg Ratzinger's German *Wikipedia* page accuses him of "publishing antisemitic hate literature," but in making the charge it ignores the fact that Ratzinger goes out of his way in the same book to attack anti-Semitism as an un-Christian ideology. The anti-Semites of Ratzinger's day were capitalizing on the hatred which Jewish business practices had created in the working classes. The source of that hatred is Jewish behavior, not Jewish DNA. And Jewish behavior has gotten out of control because the Christian majority was no longer willing to enforce the laws which had been enacted to defend the Christian social order. And the Christians lack the will to enforce the laws which protect the social order because they have become, by and large, Jews. Christian idealism has been disappearing all the while being replaced by the Jewish *Weltanshauung* in Christian circles. In the circles which feel and think like Christians, however, the revulsion at Jewish dealings and those of the baptized *conversos* is becoming more and more apparent. The reason that Christians now look on Jews with intense anger in their eyes is not to be

found in race, and not in national origin, and not in anti-Semitism. The real path of resistance lies not in anti-Semitism and its excesses. The real basis of the contemporary Jewish question lies in the moral inferiority of the Jewish view of commerce in comparison with the demands of Christianity.

"The solution to the Jewish question" lies in the application of the traditional Catholic teachings like *Sicut Judaeis non*. That means "not in allowing Christians in general to sink to the level of the lucrative occupations, but rather in raising the Jews to a higher sense of productive work, in higher numbers than is the present case, to the level of Christian mores as propounded by Christian teaching on commerce and property." And that means rejecting anti-Semitism:

> We totally reject the anti-Semitism that is now being proposed . . . in Austria and by a number of the exalted German nationalists. Anti-Semitism understood as a matter of race stands in total contradiction to the Commandment of love of neighbor, without regard to race or national origin. On the other hand, it is the duty of every true Christian and patriot to take a stand against the dangerous errors of numerous Jews in the business world and to warn their fellow Christians about the dangerous illusions of the philosemites who predominate among the ruling elites.[39]

Georg Ratzinger's accusers also ignore the fact that Jews from Heinrich Graetz to Samuel Roth have said far worse things about the Jewish business ethics which the Ashkenazi have learned from the Talmud. According to Roth, the Jews are taught that they are "the salt of the earth" and that everything they

> see before them . . . is only to be won away with the superior brain with which God has endowed his chosen ones? Each of them, when he grows up, becomes an agency of cunning to defeat the civil law. The Polish Jew does not remain in Poland. He migrates. Eventually he finds himself a rich nest in England, in France, in Germany, in America, in one of the South American countries. To each of the counties of his invasion the Jew brings the whole bag of commercial tricks and statutory maneuvers with which he poisons the arteries of the civilized world.[40]

The short hand term for "Jewish business practices" is capitalism. Given the pernicious effects which capitalism has on every traditional culture, especially traditional Catholic cultures, the nations of Europe at the end of the 19th century were faced with a choice: either enforce the laws (e.g. the prohibition against usury, child labor, etc.) which were erected by the state to protect Christian culture against the Jews who were the cutting edge of capitalist subversion or become Jews.

By now, it should be obvious which course Europe and America chose. It comes out in *The Believer* when Danny, the Jewish Nazi, attempts to solicit a $5,000 contribution from a wealthy Wall Street banker. The banker tells

Danny, "Forget the Jewish stuff; it doesn't play anymore. There's only the market now and it doesn't care who you are."

Danny: "You're a Jew. You may not realize it but you are."

Banker: "Maybe I am. Maybe we're all Jews now. What's the difference?"

Pope Benedict mentioned Georg Ratzinger in an interview conducted by Peter Seewald:

> He was my great uncle, my father's uncle. He was a clergyman who had a doctorate in theology. In his capacity as a representative in the Bavarian state legislature and in the Reichstag, he was an early advocate for the rights of farmers and of the average man in general. I read the passages in the congressional record in which he attacked child labor, something which was unheard of at the time and considered by many an affront. He was obviously a tough guy, and because of his achievements and his political stature we were all proud of him.[41]

Proud or not, a significant gulf separates Pope Benedict XVI from his great uncle. The most significant area of disagreement is their disparate views on the Jews. On the last day of February 2011, Joseph Ratzinger released volume II of his book *Jesus of Nazareth.* The big news surrounding the release of the book had to do with the Jews. As the AP headline put it, "Pope exonerates Jews for Jesus' death in new book." According to the same report, "Benedict concludes, it was the 'Temple aristocracy' and a few supporters of the figure Barabbas who were responsible," not the Jewish people.

PROUD OF HIS GREAT UNCLE

Pope Benedict should be proud of his great uncle. The real issue is whether the feeling would be reciprocal. Would a man who wrote that "There is nothing more repugnant than having to listen to educated Christians slandering their own people while at the same time glorifying the Jews" be proud of a great nephew who exonerated the Jews' of responsibility for Christ's death? Or a prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith who presided over the publication of an apology to the Jews issued by his predecessor? Probably not, because Onkel Georg had written even more pointedly:

> There would be no Jewish Question if the educated elites among the Christian peoples hadn't betrayed their own principles. At a time when Jews stand by even their own criminal element, we see Christian politicians and legislators betraying their own Christian faith on a daily basis and vying with each other to see who has the privilege of harnessing himself to the triumphal car of the Jews. In Parliament no Jew need defend another Jew, when their Christian lackeys do that for them.[42]

No matter how the traditional Catholic critique of the Jews has been effaced by recent Church pronouncements it remains extant and coherent; it remains

more coherent than the sociobiological position, because it is based on moral principles, which are then integrated into a coherent political and theological structure. The Catholic position is the opposite of the Darwinian position. According to Darwin and his epigoni, the superior race of necessity ends up victorious in any economic struggle for existence. According to the Catholic position, the opposite is true. Or as Georg Ratzinger puts it, "In a contest between two rival world views the worse element often wins the upper hand and becomes the cause for the moral corruption of the people and the collapse of the state."[43] "Under the mild and benign character of the Catholic nations there was no resistance to the exploitation practiced by the Jews and the devastation it was to cause."[44]

According to Georg Ratzinger, the Jews succeeded in getting the economy of states like Austria and Hungary under their control, not because they were more intelligent (or had "higher IQs than Caucasians," as Professor MacDonald claims) but because their internalization of Talmudic culture had allowed them to become "skilled in the deceptions of economic warfare":

> It was to be expected that the Jews, who with centuries of practice became skilled in the deceptions of economic warfare and acquired the arts of exploitation to perfection, it was to be expected that they would take center stage under the regime of free competition. The Christian, among whom the overwhelming majority were accustomed to performing productive work, and who had been taught to avoid as immoral the type of deception that was typical of the arts of economic warfare, became the first victims of this exploitation, which made the Jews rich. Not talent, but rather sharp business practices; not knowledge and ability, not productive capabilities and production, but rather deception and exploitation of others is what makes the Jew rich and admired in society. The stock exchange, lending money, usury, paying in truck, in short all of the business practices which lead to easy and quick profits without productive work are the preferred trades of the Jew. If they devote themselves to study at the university, they turn more often than not to journalism, medicine and the law, because these occupations lead most easily and quickly to riches.[45]

The same cannot be said for sociobiology, which presents a radically incoherent picture of the Jewish question, by simultaneously praising the Jews for their intelligence and excoriating them for its application. In the article we have already cited on Jewish involvement in multiculturalism MacDonald wrote, "There is indeed evidence that Jews, like East Asians, have higher IQs than Caucasians."

Ratzinger, however, dismisses the idea of superior intelligence as an explanation for the Jews' dominant role in quondam Christian societies:

> It isn't talent but rather sharp business practices; it isn't productivity but rather deception and the art of exploitation which earns the Jew his money and ensures his position of dominance among the big capitalists. . . . There is a curse upon all this egotistical business activity which leads to the wreck of society and the destruction of the social order. Everywhere where we find destruction and corruption, we find the Jew hard at work. The worst attacks against the Christian religion and against the Church are all mounted by Jews.[46]

Unlike Professor MacDonald, Georg Ratzinger considers the Jew clever and conniving but morally defective. That means that his economic system is intellectually inferior to Christian economics. Ratzinger comes to the anti-Darwinian conclusion that Jewish economics succeeds because it is inferior, both morally and economically. If economics is defined properly as the science of how to achieve the common good through economic exchange, it is ultimately inferior to the Christian economic system:

> We discover the quintessential nature of the present day Jewish question in the moral inferiority of the Jewish worldview in relation to the limitation of competition. To be precise, the overwhelming majority of Jews have no sense whatsoever of the role which morality plays in economic life. The only form of limitation which they recognize in business is the penal statute. If an opportunity to make money appears whose profit seems greater than the penalty imposed by the law, the Jew doesn't hesitate to treat the law with contempt.[47]

Jewish commerce can be characterized by two manifestations: it is based on the exploitation of the work of others without any productive activity of its own and it is characterized by gambling and speculation on the differentials in exchange as the way to achieve riches. The Christian view is the opposite. Christianity ensures decency in commerce by promoting honest toil or by promoting honest inheritance. Christianity forbids the exploitation of one's neighbor through excessive economic power, and insists on the subordination of the good of the individual to the common good, as well as concern for the economically vulnerable. There is a direct contradiction between Christianity and Judaism, and any Christian community which allows the unrestrained exercise of Jewish business practices is committing suicide.[48]

As a result of succumbing to Jewish influence:

> The banks in Austria have become dens of usury and casinos, and the businessman in the Austrian sense of the word is nothing more than a stock market speculator or a small time chiseler. The Austrian press is nothing more than an extortion racket. Political life is calculated according to financial profit. In short, commercial life in Austria is permeated not by a Christian spirit but by a Jewish one. Economic life is dominated not by the Christian dedication of the individual to the

> common good, but is dominated instead by Jewish Egotism. The state has become nothing more than an agent of the powerful, oblivious to the fact that the Christian ideal demands the dedication of the individual to the common good and especially for the protection of the weak.[49]

The problem is not bad DNA; the problem is the Talmud, which is the ultimate source of all sharp Jewish business practices:

> The Jew displays in this regard an unbelievable ruthlessness so that in little transactions they begin to accumulate the capital that allows them to exploit others. It is in this ruthlessness and in their tireless pursuit of almost imperceptible profits wherein lies the secret of Jewish success in business, but it is also therein where the danger to which the Christian population is exposed when they sink to the same level. As soon as the Polish Jew gets his foot in the door, wages are driven down and working hours are extended. Once this happens the Christian masses find themselves as if by a force of nature driven from a state of modest prosperity into the deepest misery. The Polish Jew is so deeply enmired in the teaching of the Talmud that any notion of a Christian society or a state based on the common good becomes impossible once the Jew gains the upper hand. The Polish Jew, precisely because of the influence of the Talmud, is universally a force for corruption and destruction. Wherever one finds elements of dissatisfaction which threaten to overturn the Christian social order, Jews jump to the forefront of the movement and adopt the role of agitator. Jewish agitators can be found in leadership roles throughout the socialist movement. In Vienna and Pest, the leadership of the socialist movement is entirely in Jewish hands.

Implicit in Ratzinger's thinking is a chain of propositions which begins with a survey of the economic situation in Germany and Austria at the end of 19th century and ends with a radical redefinition of the problem. There are no technical, Enlightenment solutions to this problem. The technical thinking of the Enlightenment brought the problem about in the first place by striking down the laws which had been erected under the guidance of the Church for the protection of Christians and their culture.

THE EMANCIPATION OF THE JEWS

The emancipation of the Jews dealt a fatal blow to the Christian social order. That is another way of saying that the social question (the exploitation of the worker, usury's appropriation of land, etc.) can only be solved by dealing with the Jewish question, which can only be solved by bringing about the conversion of the Jews, either completely through baptism, or formally by forcing their behavior to conform to Christian custom, as specified by *Sicut Judaeis non*. There is no point in dealing with an economic factor like state credit in isolation, especially

> when private persons determine the terms of credit. Jewish banks are now in the process of using state credit as a way of taking control of all industrial production. Herein lies the secret of the omnipotence of modern capitalist hegemony with all of its cancerous growth. Any social reform has to begin with the state establishing its independence from private equity firms as its source of credit. Only then will the source of all of capitalism's debilitating excesses be contained. To call anything else social reform is a waste of time.

It is pointless to talk about economics as if it were a science like physics when it is so closely bound up with the moral law. In order to deal with the crisis effectively, state authorities need to admit that:

> Seduction and crime are the main components of Jewish commerce. When the scions of wealthy families go astray, the easiest way to find the culprit responsible is to seek him among the Jews. The Jew supplies riding and wagon horses, equipage and dogs; he encourages the acting out of all base desires and the adoption of degenerate lifestyles; he is the fence and the pimp. Once he has established his influence over his rich young protégé, he encourages him to speculate on the stock market in order to win back the money he squandered on his vices. In this way the Jew brings about his complete ruin in a few years, which is when his fortune ends up in hands of his Jewish seducer. Anyone who is familiar with the realities of social life in Paris, Vienna, and Pest sees this sort of thing all the time. These seductive arts are closely allied with prostitution. Every aspect of trafficking in young females is firmly in Jewish hands and organized on an international basis. It's only a short step from this immoral trafficking to criminal activity. When it comes to embezzlement, misappropriation, fraud, usury, blackmail, etc., the Jew is involved to a much greater percentage than the Christian.

Capitalism, which is another term for "*Juedisches Erwerbsleben*," or Jewish business practice, has its roots in looting:

> In this way, Jewish business practices are similar to those of desert nomads who make use of their fleet horses of the steppes to conduct looting expeditions on settlements which pursue settled economic pursuits. In doing this they appropriate what they can drag off on their raids. They then live like kings off of "what they have earned" in the desert until the loot is all gone and another looting expedition is necessary. Jewish "commerce" has never been able to grow beyond its roots in looting. The majority of Jews has no idea of how to make a living from honest toil, nor do they want to learn how to do such a thing.[50]

> There are many forms of slavery that need to be abolished. What the Arab is to Africa, the usury Jew is to Europe. Both Semitic races live only off the exploitation of others, by looting. That is the revenant of the nomadic

> life of these tribes. Thousand years of living in the desert accustomed them to sudden attacks, and they learned through this to booty off of the work of others. The entire Jewish-oriental way of doing business is deeply suffused with the characteristics of looting. One industry after another is singled out for looting, until finally whole nations have been plundered.[51]

Because of this, Jewish business practices are totally antithetical to the economy of a Christian culture, which is based on an understanding and appreciation of the value of work:

> In the instruction manuals from the Middle Ages, the people were taught that "Man is born to work, as the bird is created to fly." The Catholic Church raised the nations under her care to be workers and made earning by work the foundation of our civilization. There is only one way of earning a living which is worthy of respect and esteem, and that is earning a living by toil, whether that entails labor of a physical or an intellectual sort. It makes no difference whether this labor takes place on the lowest rung of the economic ladder among day-laborers or among the professions of the elite. In doing this the Church erected civilization upon an entirely new foundation. The pagan world proposed a life lived at the expense of others (slavery); Judaism preached preferential treatment for its own people, but permitted the exploitation and practicing usury on alien nations. And until this day Jewish business practices exhibit this dual nature. On the one hand, we see concern for the family and for his fellow Jew, but on the other a totally heartless exploitation via usury of the goyim, which becomes the source of the wealth accumulated by Jewish billionaires. . . . The ancient principle of the Catholic Church, which only honors commerce when it is based on honest work, is drowned out by the Jewish screeching which encourages speculation and gambling on the stock market.[52]

By the last decade of the 19th century, it had become clear to thinkers like Georg Ratzinger that the laws enacted in the wake of the Enlightenment and its concomitant revolutions spelled economic disaster for Europe. The only solutions to the economic crisis was a return to Christian-inspired state regulation of the economy. "The Jews," Ratzinger opined,

> must once again learn to subordinate themselves to Christian social reform and to conform their business practices to Christian norms. All of the money which they have earned through state-sanctioned usury and the exploitation of the worker must be returned to the people. The legislatures must now criminalize all of the fraud and exploitation which now has established itself under the rubric of free enterprise. The state needs to prosecute in a public manner all forms of usury and fraudulent exploitation. The current laws against usury and fraud are much too one-

> sided, and they do not correspond either to the experience or the plain sense of Christian jurisprudence.

There is no middle ground; there are no neutral scientific laws. Either the Christian State must force Jews to acknowledge the superiority of their laws and conform to them, or, under the guise of tolerance and enlightenment, Christians will end up by becoming Jews via an unregulated, capitalist, Jewish economy:

> Just think how contagious usury was then [during the middle ages] and how quickly public morality declined as a result. What germs are to epidemics, so is bad example on the moral level. It is irresponsible to give a free pass to contagious toxins by promoting a false view of life, unless you want the entire social organism to get sick. The disease of our culture consists in the cancerous spread of the Jewish-heathen worldview over the moral norms of Christendom. The inferiority of the Jewish-heathen worldview to Christianity must be made apparent, by the actions of the Christian state.

The solution to the social question can only come about when the Christian idea of commerce has vanquished the Jewish-heathen idea. True protection of the social order is only possible in the confessional state. "Business practice must be made to conform once again to Christian morals":

> Intoxicated by revolution, Christian nations have pawned their most precious jewel – the teaching and the grace of their savior – and have rejected their most precious asset, their character as redeemed children of the Lord, by abandoning the Christian basis for their culture. The Lord as a result has let the Christian nations go their own way, which has led to the debt bondage which flows from the obdurate hegemony of capital, which will end up concentrated in the hands of a small minority of Jews and their lackeys.

The Jews will also benefit from these reforms:

> Clear limits on Judaism in not only necessary for the interests of the Christian nations; it is also in the interest of the Jews themselves. Only when the sane principles of Christian reform have been put in place, can we hope to disarm the specter of anti-Semitic racial hatred. It is only then that we can hope to avoid the path of the violent taking the law into their own hands. Those who think that a small minority of Jews with the help of the power of the state can solve this problem, are deceiving themselves.

To put the case another way, if reform is not forthcoming, the Jews will be the first to suffer because:

> The hegemony of social corruption has ended in every age in terror. This solution is no longer plausible. Either we are going to have Christian reform in our future or we are going to have the reign of racial hatred. The

> Jews should be under no illusions about what they can expect from the racial hatred that is waiting for them in the near future. Their arrogance is going to turn quickly into bitter disappointment in the future.

ESPECIALLY PROPHETIC

Ratzinger was especially prophetic when he wrote in 1892:

> A reaction against the jewification of our culture is now building momentum among the common man. That movement is hardly perceptible today, but it is going to grow like an avalanche. That movement would be irresistible at this very moment if it weren't lacking a leader. [Ratzinger's word was, of course the German word "Fuehrer," which took on a new dimension some 40 years later.]

What he said of working class Christians in the 1890s was true of Muslims in 2011:

> What the Christian earns by the sweat of his brow, the Jew lays hold of via usury, fraud, and cheating the worker out of a decent wage, and he squanders the money he appropriates in luxury and wretched excess. Confronted with these excesses, the moral consciousness of the working class finds itself consumed with rage, and since the government and the legislature provide no protection against the usurious and exploitative Jews and their lackeys, the people take to the streets. That is the meaning of anti-Semitism and the uproar it is now causing. We see in this a kind of economic self-defense and the moral defense mechanism of the exploited. It's a sign to the government and the legislature that the necessary legal protection isn't there, and a sign that the administration and the legal system aren't offering the assistance that they need to offer. Anti-Semitism is a serious and ultimate warning to the ruling class. If this warning is ignored, if the ruling class thinks that they deal with the people with bayonettes, then we are heading toward a revolution that is going to make the Reformation and the French revolution look like child's play by comparison.

Ratzinger is aware of the Darwinian notion that life involves struggle among individuals and ethnic groups. He simply takes that notion of struggle out of the biological realm and situates it instead in the moral cultural arena, as when he writes: "Any ethnic group which is totally lacking in moral restraint when it comes to economic life will end up the winner in any struggle for existence. This is the secret of Jewish success in Austria-Hungary."[53] Similarly, Ratzinger isn't denying that life is a struggle; he is simply unwilling to say, as the sociobiologists must, that the cause of the victors in cultural warfare is *ipso facto* just:

> The life of nations is like the life of individuals. He who fails to engage in battle daily to secure his position in society will soon disappear. The Catholics in Austro-Hungary have failed to engage in the daily battle for their possessions, and as a result they lose year after year one institution after another. They have been dispossessed from top to bottom, from their universities as well as their kindergartens. The Jews, who make up less than 10 percent of the population, have as a result of their energetic and unified and self-confident activity won a victory over the 90 percent of the population which is Catholic and have everywhere occupied the positions which the Catholics have abandoned.[54]

If survival of the fittest is the fundamental law of sociobiology, then Jews must be the master race. Hitler got it almost right. Conversely, when it comes to the struggle for existence, white guys are losers; from the sociobiological perspective, the highest thing anyone can aspire to be is a Jew. Hence, David's delight when he found that he had Jewish DNA in his cells. He was now a member of the master race, which of course, was at the same time, the enemy of the entire human race. This leads him to the contradictory assertion "I'm a product of my times. I am my genes." What he means to say is that the upheaval in his life caused by the sexual revolution left him uprooted and without any sense of identity. Since he lives in a materialist scientistic culture, finding his roots took a biological turn, helped of course by the sociobiology he imbibed from the writings of Professor MacDonald. Talk about race is the ultimate sign of deracination.

If Georg Ratzinger's explanation of the rise of Jewish power is superior to Kevin MacDonald's, a different picture emerges. David became a Jew not because he discovered superior DNA in his cells, but because the Catholic Church failed to preach the gospel. We are talking about failure on a massive scale. In Georg Ratzinger's day when the Catholic confessional state was in power in places like Bavaria and the double monarchy of Austro-Hungary, Catholic elites refused to enforce the (largely economic) laws on the books which protected the weak in a Christian culture.

Then came the Thirty Years War (1915-1945) which put the revolutionary elites in power after World War II. By 1960, farseeing church men like Alfredo Cardinal Ottaviani saw that European Christian culture needed strengthening against assaults from the Jewish elites in both the East and the West, as represented by Freudianism and Communism, Hollywood movies, fast food, rock 'n' roll—in short, everything that Federico Fellini discussed in *La Dolce Vita*, the seminal 1960 document.

Instead of regaining the initiative, the Catholic Church used the council which Ottaviani persuaded Pope John XXIII to convoke as a way of internalizing the commands of her oppressors. The Church which used *Dignitatis Humanae* as a pretext to abandon the confessional state (even though the document affirms the opposite) and *Nostra Aetate* as a pretext to abandon

its efforts to preach the Gospel to the Jews and work for their conversion, created a world in which Jews who recognized the synagogue's attack on logos and recoiled from it in disgust had no alternative but to become Jewish Nazis, because Hitler had succeeded Christ as the antithesis of what it meant to be a Jew. David Cooper and Danny Balint are infallible signs that the Church is not doing its job. Whenever a Jew recoils in disgust from the nihilism which is the essence of the Jewish religion, his first thought should be, "This is what St. Paul meant when he said the Jews are 'the enemy of the entire human race.' This is what the Church has been saying all along."

This thought did not pop into David's mind because the Church has abandoned her mission of evangelization to the people who need it the most, the people to whom Christ preached exclusively when he walked this earth.

When pushed on the matter, David will admit, "In theory I was a Catholic. But they didn't tell me anything. My dad left the Church" as a result of the divorce, and after that David's exposure to Catholicism was attending "the hippie Mass at St. John's" in the company of his sexually liberated mother. As part of his Catholic upbringing, David's mom told him that "the priest at St. John's is gay." The net result of this failure on the Church's part was deracination. David felt totally rootless, cut off from any familial or cultural or religious tradition. As a result, he began to see those roots in his DNA. Race would provide what David's church and family failed to give him.

"I wanted to know who I am. Race is not a social construct. Race and ethnicity is about biology." Then after discovering his Jewish DNA, David joined the synagogue, where he learned that "Judaism doesn't involve a relationship with God." Now after learning that the rabbi and most of his congregation are atheists, David is feeling spiritually restless again.

"Technically I'm a Jew," he says, "but my heart's not in it."

The logic is not as convoluted as one might think. After being exposed to the full nihilism of the Jewish "faith," the Jew recoils in horror and disgust. At that point, he either devotes himself to some lesser god such as money or sex, or he recoils completely and looks for the opposite of what he learned in the synagogue. The Catholic Church is the true opposite of what gets taught in the synagogue, but the Church has not been proclaiming Church teaching on the Jews for decades. As a result, in his search for the antithesis of everything Judaism stands for, the Jew discovers the Nazis, whose racial beliefs are the mirror image of Judaism, and the Jew becomes a Nazi.

By virtue of his baptism, David is a Catholic, which he admits in more candid moments, "I've been to Mass more times than I've been to the synagogue." Why then does he think he's a Jew? The initial answer to that question is Kevin MacDonald and DNA testing. The real answer, however, lies in the massive failure of the contemporary Catholic Church either to live or proclaim the gospel. To begin with the living part, the priest he got to

know best as a child was a regular guest at their house because he was having an affair with his mother.

> When I was 11 years old, my mom met and seduced a monsignor. The relationship lasted for as long as 20 years. Maybe more. I don't know when it ended. He died a few years ago. I don't know how much more I'll say about it, but I'd like for you to let it lie. Please don't poke around about it. Thank you. Of course, it takes two to tango. I couldn't exactly say who seduced whom. She wanted to marry him, and she says he talked about that as a possibility for many years. The whole thing disgusts me. Talk about sacrosanct and profane. I'll probably never forgive her for this, or some other transgressions.

The failure of the Church to proclaim the gospel is not unrelated to moral failure. The contemporary Church's intellectual cowardice in proclaiming the Gospel teaching on the Jews puts its moral turpitude in sexual matters in the shade by comparison. Everything the contemporary Catholic Church has to say about the Jews is either insipid or flat out wrong and a contradiction of everything the Gospels and the Church Fathers had to say on the matter.

The Church has all but officially proclaimed that it is not interested in converting the Jews. The American bishops had proclaimed in their own catechism that the Mosaic covenant was eternally valid and that Jews could be saved by following it. That this was a heretical, flat out contradiction of the Gospel, finally dawned on the bishops and they deleted the offending statement.

Those organizations which do claim to be interested in the conversion of the Jews, turn out to be, upon closer inspection, the opposite of what they claim to be. The Association of Hebrew Catholics is a good case in point. Instead of working for the conversion of the Jews, the AHC works instead for the preservation of pockets of Jewish DNA within the Church. Instead of working to integrate Jewish converts into Church life, the AHC attempts to create Jewish ghettos based on what can only be construed as racial and therefore heretical principles.

In the February 2006 issue of *Culture Wars*, Theologian Raymond Kevane, theological advisor to the AHC pointed out these heretical principles publically to David Moss, the organization's president, after years of trying to get an answer from him privately:

> Not too long ago (March 2005) in a public statement on EWTN, Dave Moss rejected the idea that the Church replaced the people of Israel. He clearly identified the latter idea as an "erroneous theology" that was taught for 2000 years by the Catholic Church. He further stated that the Church no longer teaches that the people of Israel are superseded. They are an eternal people with an irrevocable calling. How can any individual

> declare that the Catholic Church . . . . has taught erroneous theology for 2000 years.[55]
>
> Both statements are heretical. The most important "irrevocable calling" for the Jews is the same as for the rest of us—to save their immortal souls. In one stroke Dave Moss denied the Scripture as inspired by God, the infallibility of the Pope and Ecumenical councils and the fact of Tradition (the office of the Magisterium of the Catholic Church). No Catholic can say that the Church has held and erroneous theology for 2000 years and still remain a Catholic.[56]
>
> In almost every century there has been an effort to bring the rites of the Jewish religion into the Catholic Church. Every time it has arisen it has caused great harm to the Catholic Church before finally being discredited.
>
> So when Dave Moss said that the Church was in theological error for 2000 years, he denied the infallibility of the pope and the councils of the Church
>
> The Council of Florence. . . firmly believes and professes, and teaches . . . that whoever, even after the passion, placed hope in these mattes of the law and submitted himself to them as necessary for salvation, as if faith in Christ could not save without them, sinned mortally. . . .
>
> To reinstate in the Catholic Church any of the Judaic rituals of the Old Testament would be to suggest that the Sacrifice by Christ is not perfect.

It turns out that the AHC isn't interested in Jewish conversion at all:

> David Moss told me . . . that he doesn't believe that the AHC should be involved in "targeting" other Jews, but rather to simply "converse" or "dialogue" with them. But if that's true, then the converted Jew is not obeying the command of Christ "Go forth and preach the Gospel to all nations."

On August 5, 2010, David Moss, president of the Association of Hebrew Catholics, interviewed Archbishop Raymond L. Burke, who was then head of the Apostolic Signatura in Rome. Moss's tendentious questions were largely formulated in response to the objections which Raymond Kevane raised in his *Culture Wars* article but remained unanswered. In response to a question about the special role the "Hebrew" Catholic might play in the Church, Burke ignored the issue and thinking that he was agreeing with Moss claimed that "We [i.e., Catholics] are the sons and daughters of Abraham, and we feel the closest bond to the Jewish people." Burke, of course, implied here that we feel this bond because the Jews can also construe themselves as children of Abraham, even though this assertion is contradicted by the Gospel of St.

John, which states quite clearly that followers of Christ can call themselves children of Moses, but those who reject Christ, i.e., the Jews, cannot. Burke then added, "A Hebrew Catholic has a distinctive witness to give in the church. They are particularly cherished because of the rich heritage they bring to the church."

Is his excellency referring to the Talmud here? If not, it's difficult to see what other heritage the Jew can bring to the Church, since that rejection of logos is the heart of the Jewish religion.

NOT IMPRESSED

David Cooper wasn't impressed by this sort of outreach. In fact, he's hoping that the Church maintains its position as "a last bastion of anti-Semitism" because American Protestants in his view have been Judaized. The Catholic Church is a repudiation of Judaism, in David's view because Jesus Christ's teaching was a repudiation of the religion of that time and place. The Talmud is not based on the Hebrew Bible. They start with the Mishna, spoken word brought down from Mt. Sinai. From there it is only a short step to concluding as the rabbi did at Baruch Goldstein's funeral, that 10,000 Palestinian children aren't worth one Jewish fingernail.

David's experiences in the synagogue confirmed the nihilism which Danny Balint discovered at the heart of Judaism as a Yeshiva student: "I've never met a Jew who believes in God," David opined. "My rabbi does not believe in God. None of the Jews in my congregation believes in God. I have yet to find a Jew who believes in a divine God."

It was this discovery of nihilism at the heart of Judaism which led David to conclude that "Jews make the best anti-Semites." It also led him to conclude that the greatest anti-Semite of all time, as well as one of the modern era's greatest nihilists, was Jewish.

"Hitler's dad's dad was Jewish," David said. "His dad's mom worked in a Jewish household and the man of the house impregnated her when she was around 40." It led Danny Balint to the same conclusion in *The Believer*, when he asks rhetorically, "So Hitler's the chief rabbi now?"

Danny is right. Hitler is the chief rabbi now. He attained that position by default when the Church stopped working for the conversion of the Jews.

Chapter Nine

The Bishops and the Logic of Events

One thing rowing teaches you is that even when you're not rowing you're still moving. It's a lesson that the American bishops seem condemned to learn in spite of themselves. In 2012, they were caught up in a logic of events not of their making, and swept by the stream of history to a place where none of them would choose to go. There is only one being whose intentions are determinative of events and He seems to be leading the bishops to a new understanding of the relationship between church and state in America. The logic of events led them willy nilly into a position where the logic of America was at odds with the logic of the Catholic Church at the very moment when they would all exclaim that John Courtney Murray and *Dignitatis Humanae* had long ago laid this issue to rest.

On April 14 2012, Bishop Daniel Jenky, ordinary of the diocese of Peoria, Illinois, gave a homily in which he called on Catholics to resist the Obama administration's attempt to force Catholic charities to pay for contraception, sterilization and abortion.

In his homily, Bishop Jenky said, "This fall, every practicing Catholic must vote, and must vote their Catholic consciences, or by the following fall our Catholic schools, our Catholic hospitals, our Catholic Newman Centers, all our public ministries—only excepting our church buildings—could easily be shut down. Because no Catholic institution, under any circumstance, can ever cooperate with the intrinsic evil of killing innocent human life in the womb." Jenky then drew historical parallels.

> Remember that in past history other governments have tried to force Christians to huddle and hide only within the confines of their churches like the first disciples locked up in the Upper Room.
>
> In the late 19th century, Bismarck waged his "*Kulturkampf*," a Culture War, against the Roman Catholic Church, closing down every Catholic school and hospital, convent and monastery in Imperial Germany.
>
> Clemenceau, nicknamed "the priest eater," tried the same thing in France in the first decade of the 20th Century.

> Hitler and Stalin, at their better moments, would just barely tolerate some churches remaining open, but would not tolerate any competition with the state in education, social services, and health care.
>
> In clear violation of our First Amendment rights, Barack Obama—with his radical, pro abortion and extreme secularist agenda, now seems intent on following a similar path.

On Wednesday, April 18, Lonnie Nasatir, the regional director of Chicago's Anti-Defamation League, demanded an apology from Jenky, calling his remarks "outrageous, offensive, and completely over the top."

"Clearly," Nasatir continued, "Bishop Jenky needs a history lesson. There are few if any parallels in history to the religious intolerance and anti-Semitism fostered in society by Stalin, and especially Hitler, who under his regime perpetrated the open persecution of Jews, Catholics and many other minorities."

On Monday, April 23, a petition circulated among faculty members of the University of Notre Dame demanding that Bishop Jenky apologize to the ADL. By late Tuesday afternoon of April 24, 131 faculty members had signed the petition.

That letter, which was addressed to President John Jenkins of Notre Dame, concluded by saying:

> We request that you issue a statement on behalf of the university that will definitively distance Notre Dame from Bishop Jenky's incendiary statement. Further we feel that it would be in the best interest of Notre Dame if Bishop Jenky resigned from the university's board of fellows if his is unwilling to renounce loudly and publicly this destructive analogy.

It was a textbook case of the Jewish revolutionary spirit in action. The Jews singled out their victim and accused him of thought crimes, and the revolutionary cadre at Notre Dame rose up in response to the accusation and tried to force Jenky out of the university's governing board. It's an open secret at Notre Dame that the revolutionaries want to remove the Holy Cross order from its governing position there. The ADL accusation gave them their *causus belli*. The diocese of Peoria issued a clarification of Bishop Jenky's remarks after the ADL issued its challenge, but no apology.

On Wednesday, April 25, an article by Notre Dame Law School Professor emeritus Charles E. Rice appeared on the Cardinal Newman society website describing the incident. Rice concluded:

> Bishop Jenky deserves appreciation for so urgently reminding Catholics of their civic duty. He spoke the Truth as a Bishop ought to speak. And his judgment and courage reflect the finest tradition of a Notre Dame that has gone missing. Pray for Bishop Jenky, for Notre Dame, for our Church and for our country.

But he never said who sparked the controversy, namely, the ADL, nor did he advert to the fact that it was specifically to the ADL that Jenky was being ordered to apologize by the Notre Dame petition signers.

This is not surprising. In mid-December 2011, Charlie Rice approached me at a party and told me how much he enjoyed reading the reprint of the 1890 *Civiltà Cattolica* articles on the Jewish question which had recently appeared in *Culture Wars*.

Two days later, Charlie called me up to say that he was wrong in praising the articles because the Church has since decided that Catholics are not to mention the Jews as being responsible for social ills. I responded by saying that he should articulate his position in a letter to the editor, and that letter appeared in the February 2012 issue. Charlie claimed that the Church, in spite of what had appeared in *Civiltà Cattolica* and Catholic pronouncements too numerous to mention going all the way back to the Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, had now deemed that mentioning Jews as the cause of social ills was off limits. "The common good," he wrote, "requires restrictions and prohibitions directed not against a religious or ethnic group as such, but against specific evils contrary to that common good."

This prompted David Wemhoff to write that the *Civilta* articles were based on *Sicut Judaeis non* which is Magisterial Church teaching on the Jewish question and which very specifically is "directed . . . against a religious . . . group as such," namely the Jews. "Rice," Wemhoff continued,

> bases his dissent to SJN upon what he claims is the "clear and practical" teaching by the Magisterium "in more recent decades". Yet he is anything but clear as to which teaching of the Magisterium he now claims leads to the rejection of SJN, nor can he point to a document that abrogates Pope St. Gregory's papal constitution. Instead, he presents a mishmash of ideas and a smattering of terms to justify his view.

Rice cites *Dignitatis Humanae*, the Vatican II Declaration on Religious Liberty to buttress his position, but this won't fly either because "*DH* makes clear that religious liberty is not an absolute right (*DH* para. 7), and may be curtailed for reasons of public order or peace, which includes upholding the moral order and the common good, because religious liberty is not a right to error" (*DH* para. 7; CCC 2108-2109).

The Jew who paid for the translation of the *Civiltà Cattolica* articles on the Jewish Question and urged me to run them in *Culture Wars*, responded to Rice by saying, in effect that for the past 50 years the Church has been talking to the wrong Jews. "The main problem is no different then, or now, or in New Testament times, which is that the Pharisee is our eternal enemy." Neturei Karta supports the position the Vatican advocated in the *Civiltà Cattolica* articles. Jews cannot in good conscience be citizens. The Church, for some

unknown reason, insists on engaging in dialogue with the Reformed Jews, who in his words,

> filled Germany and the United States with evil, and can be best exemplified by the Masonic Anti-Defamation League. Here is a group that visits the Vatican in the spirit of interfaith dialogue that Professor Rice seems to extol, while being the chief promoters of homosexuality rights and abortion in the world. We can directly attribute to them over a billion abortion murders around the world through their influence which is the greatest crime against humanity ever perpetrated since the world was created. Does the good Professor Rice wish us to support citizenship for these mass murderers whose innocent and helpless victim's blood cries from the earth for vengeance? What we have tried to show is that those Jews who are their highest do not want citizenship as they wish to live in the Diaspora until their Messiah comes in peace with their neighbors, and instead of the Roman Catholic Church seeking them out for dialogue, they extend their hand of friendship to the ADL. This gives the ADL sanction as a Jewish group in the west when they are nothing of the kind instead of the true representatives of Judaism which agree a great deal with our values.

According to the Jew who gave me the *Civiltà Cattolica* articles to publish in *Culture Wars*, the Church needs to work for the conversion of the Jews, and even if the Church can't bring them to full conversion, i.e., membership in the Church, they need to work for their moral conversion, which means keeping their natural tendency to subversion in check.

In their campaign against Obamacare, the bishops were crippled by what we might call the Rice Approach to the Abortion Issue. Instead of working for the conversion of their enemies, the Jews who are "the enemies of the entire human race" and the one group without whose efforts abortion would not have been legalized in either the United States or Canada, the bishops asked their elder brothers for support in defending "religious freedom."

As anyone who has not deliberately blinded himself to political reality could have predicted, this attempt at dialogue has failed miserably. Every Jewish organization which responded to the government's new health care program demanded that the government deny the Church any conscience clause exemptions. So much for the fruits of almost 50 years of Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

The true answer to the conundrum of the Catholic voter who rightly feels betrayed by every prolife politician who has been sent to Washington by his vote is that Jew money trumps prolife promises every day of the week. If a Catholic politician is beholden to Jew money, as Gingrich and Santorum were, they can be trusted to do what the Jews want when they get into office, not what the Catholics want. This means more war and no end to abortion.

This also means that the "vote prolife" strategy will continue to be a dismal failure, largely because of the theological blindness which Professor Rice's prohibitions have inflicted on the Catholic voter.

The Catholic mind has become the captive of two bad ideas, stemming from two failed experiments which got launched in the wake of Vatican II, namely, dialogue with the Jews and religious liberty.

Dialogue with the Jews had led to the widespread illusion among bishops that the "the people who put the Lord Jesus to death and the prophets too," namely the Jews, who are "the enemies of the whole human race," are somehow not only our friends but our "elder brothers."

The idea of "religious liberty" has been equally destructive.

In the four-page letter to the American bishops on March 2, 2012, Cardinal Timothy Dolan mentioned the phrase "religious freedom" no less than 15 times. After citing the words of Pope Benedict XVI, Dolan claimed that "Bishop Stephen Blaire and Bishop William Lori, with so many others, have admirably kept us focused on this one priority of protecting religious freedom. We have made it clear in no uncertain terms to the government that we are not at peace with this invasive attempt to curtail the religious freedom we cherish as Catholics and Americans. We did not ask for this fight, but we will not run from it."

I was tempted to ask should "protecting religious freedom" be our "one priority"? Or should ending abortion be our priority? Or should evangelization be our priority. Or should we work for the conversion of our enemies? To what extent does the acceptance of religious freedom cripple the Catholic Church in carrying out its mission of evangelization?

In late March I attended a lecture by Bishop Kevin Rhoades, ordinary of the diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, on the topic of religious liberty. The sponsor for the lecture was the St. Joseph Valley Jewish Federation. In the question and answer period following his lecture, I mentioned the Church at the top of Mount Adams in Cincinnati, which I try to visit whenever I am in town. On the wall behind the altar, there is a mural which depicts the city of Cincinnati as well as two angels holding a banner, which reads in German, "*Heilige Marie, bete fuer die Bekehrung dieses Landes.*" "Holy Mary, pray for the conversion of this country."

"Did these German Catholics get it wrong when they commissioned that artist to do that mural?" I asked Bishop Rhoades. "Wasn't it presumptuous of them to want to convert the country which had accepted them as immigrants, especially since that country guaranteed 'religious freedom'?"

To his credit the bishop gave a good answer. He came down firmly on the side of working for conversion and evangelization. It was clear, however, that his answer did no go over well with the Jews who had sponsored his talk. The rabbi of one of the local synagogues challenged the bishop by claiming that every religion had to compromise its principles to get along in America.

The irony in his statement lies, of course, in the fact that if there is one group which gets to impose its religious views—from support for Israel to support for abortion—on the rest of us, it is the Jews.

The bishop's answer did not go over well with the Jews because they knew that if Catholics are supposed to work for the conversion of America, they must also work for the conversion of the Jews, which is precisely what the bishops avoided by focusing their campaign on "religious freedom."

The ADL made a mistake when it demanded an apology from Bishop Jenky. Not only was no apology forthcoming, but the supporters of the Jewish revolutionary spirit among the faculty at Notre Dame revealed their names and positions to their foes with nothing to show for it.

In making their futile demand for an apology, the Jews antagonized a group of people, the bishops, who were their staunchest allies, every bit as much as the Obama administration antagonized a group that was fervent in their support of the American proposition and the American regime.

RATZINGER'S BOOK

Professor Rice's comments are based on a notion of equality which he claims to have deduced from Church teaching. How it differs from the French Revolution's notion of equality is, however, not clear. The French Revolution notion suggests that all groups are equal and, therefore, to be treated equally. This is stated dogmatically as a premise in the form of a slogan—Liberty, Fraternity, Equality—and was put to immediate political use.

This dogmatic claim about equality falls to pieces the minute theology enters the picture. In any analysis of history, one fact becomes apparent. The Jews are different. They have always been different. The Jews began as something unique. They were God's chosen people. When the Jews rejected Christ as their Messiah, their status changed radically but it was no less unique. The Jews who rejected Christ became "enemies of the whole human race" (I Thess 2:14). In rejecting Christ, the Jews rejected Logos and in rejecting Logos became subverters of the social order, revolutionaries and a pernicious influence whenever they gained control over the culture of any Christian country. The Jews' history and continued existence makes a mockery of the notion of equality. This is probably why defenders of the Enlightenment like Voltaire hated the Jews. In other words, no other group of people on the face of this earth is like the Jews.

The Church recognized this early on and came up with its own way of dealing with the problems which the Jews cause in their unique way. The doctrine is known as *Sicut Judaeis non* and as David Wemhoff has pointed out, this teaching and the corollaries which flow from it have not and cannot be revoked by the Church.

But Professor Rice says that the Church was wrong when it treated the Jews as a special group and a social problem. The authors of the *Civiltà Cattolica* articles were wrong in singling out the Jews and even more wrong when they claimed the Jews were the source of social ills.

Professor Rice's statement is theologically and philosophically preposterous. It is modernist in its theology because it claims that the Church until 1965 was in error, and it is erroneous philosophically. Beyond that it cripples any effective social action because it prohibits Catholics from identifying the problems the Church clearly.

How is it possible, to give a contemporary example, to talk about American foreign policy now without speaking about the Israel Lobby? American foreign policy is now a function of Jewish money and is completely incomprehensible if we ban that thought *a priori* from any discussion.

Professor Rice's approach to the abortion issue is doomed to failure because it ignores the most salient point about the abortion: abortion is from the Jews.

All of the historical evidence in America, where abortion laws were overturned by two Jews—Bernard Nathanson and Lawrence Lader—and Canada, where the Jew Henry Morgenthaler flouted abortion laws until they were overturned, points to Jewish complicity in erecting the culture of abortion death. Rice maintains his position even though Bernard Nathanson said that America would have rejected the campaign to decriminalize abortion if they had known that it was the work of "a bunch of crazy Jews from New York."

What was true then remains true. "Who wants Obamacare so badly" that they were willing to force Obama to antagonize the Catholics in an election year? The answer, David Wemhoff wrote in *Culture Wars* lies neither with the liberals, nor Glenn Beck's "progressives," nor the Democrats. The answer lies with the same group that so ardently wanted Obamacare, and insisted on the narrow exemptions that the Catholics decried. The answer is persecution of the Catholic Church by the very people the Catholic leadership calls the "elder brethren."

> While the Catholics were wringing their hands and gnashing their teeth on January 20, the National Council of Jewish Women (NCJW) "applauded the decision by Secretary of Health and Human Services Kathleen Sebelius" and as a result of this decision "millions more women will gain access to this key preventive health benefit [contraceptive coverage] without jeopardizing their economic security." The NCJW, which is "inspired by Jewish values" and "strives for social justice by improving the quality of life for women, children, and families and by safeguarding individual rights and freedoms," decried and "adamantly and actively opposed" the hard lobbying efforts to "allow a broadly defined array of religiously affiliated employers to refuse to provide contraceptive coverage."[1a]

> The Jews, especially the Reform Action Council (RAC), had supported the passage of Obamacare along with its mandated coverage of contraception and sterilizations,[2] as had the United Jewish Communities, the Jewish Council for Public Affairs.[3] When Obamacare was signed into law in March, 2010, it was reported that a "slew of Jewish groups issued statements in support and looking forward to its signature into law by President Obama."[4] Among these groups were B'nai B'rith International, the Religious Action Committee of the Reform Jewish Movement, the National Jewish Democratic Council, the Republican Jewish Coalition.[5] The NJDC summed up the situation when it stated "This bill also reflects the clear groundswell of support in the American Jewish Community – both among individuals and organizations – for the change in our health care system that's so desperately needed today."[6]

The Rice approach to abortion in effect blinds Catholics and anyone else who opposes abortion to the political realities which continue to keep the abortion regime in power.

To begin with, the battle over the HHS regs which force the Catholic Church to pay for abortion is incomprehensible if we ignore the contribution which the Jews have made to the abortion culture in America. Abortion is from the Jews, and the most vociferous supporters of abortion in America continue to be Jews. They are also the most significant political group which wants to deny Catholics conscience clause exemptions.

But the connection between Jewish interest and this political campaign go deeper still. The Obama administration, following the advice of the Pentagon, was determined to resist the Likud pressure to attack Iran, probably because it would be prove not only militarily but economically disastrous. In order to stand up to right-wing Likudnik Jews like Binyamin Netanyahu, Obama needed the support of the left-wing Rabbi Saperstein, and pro-gay marriage Jews, who consider abortion and sodomy their sacraments. This explains why Obama was willing to antagonize Catholic bishops during an election year. If we ignore the Jewish issue, the whole situation becomes politically incomprehensible.

This is equally apparent if we look at the 2012 Republican primary. The Republican race is incomprehensible if we ignore Jewish influence. All of the Republican candidates were unequivocal in their opposition to abortion. This is especially true of the two Catholic candidates, Newt Gingrich and Rick Santorum.

This was not always the case. In fact, one of the biggest prolife achievements over the past 40 years has been to convince Republican candidates to oppose abortion. After attempting to freeze the issue out of the debate during the 1976 election, three years after *Roe v. Wade*, the Republicans under Ronald Reagan tried a different strategy, which landed Reagan in the White House. George Bush senior was a notorious population controller, but he got the right-to-life

religion when he decided to run for president. Bob Dole made his disdain for the abortion issue patent when he said he hadn't read the platform opposing it, as did Newt Gingrich in 1994, when he banned abortion from his Contract with America. But with George Bush junior, prolife views became mandatory for Republican candidates. Unfortunately, no Republican, with the exclusion of Donald Trump, has ever done anything to implement his prolife views. So how then is a voter to evaluate a candidate who claims to be prolife?

The answer to that question lies in an examination of the ethnic bedrock upon which every political superstructure in America must be constructed. Ethnic reality is based on the triple melting pot. Americans are ethnically Protestants, Catholics or Jews, and they have been engaged in covert ethnic warfare with each other as long as they have been here in significant numbers. No one can get elected without the Catholic vote, but the Jews control the political process through their money and their control of the media. If anyone still has doubts about Jewish control of the political process, then the 29 standing ovations that the American congress gave to Binyamin Netanyahu in May 2011, shortly after President Obama tried to restart the peace process by returning Israel to its 1967 borders, should lay those doubts to rest.

The Jews control the political process, but they need Catholic footsoldiers to pull the right lever in November, and the surest way to ensure this outcome is to find a Catholic who is willing to do the bidding of the Jews after Jew money has put him safely in office. The Jews have found two such Catholics in Newt Gingrich and Rick Santorum, both of whom work for the American Enterprise Institute. Newt Gingrich made the news in the middle of his now failed campaign when he called the Palestians an "invented people." That remark alone earned him a $2 million contribution from Sheldon Adelson, the casino magnate.

These statements are either true or false. If false, then they need to be exposed as such. If true, then they need to be acted upon. To rule them out of bounds *a priori* because of some supposed change in the "Magisterium" or because they are an offense against "equality" or "human dignity" or both is not only theologically preposterous it is politically disastrous, and in the case of abortion, this self-inflicted blindness has life and death consequences because it condemns prolife efforts to ultimate failure, the fate of prolife politics for the past 40 years. Professor Rice is to be commended for his efforts for the unborn, but acknowledging his good deeds does not mean that we have to blind ourselves to political reality and continue to support a strategy which has failed.

When it looked as if Ron Paul, the only candidate who was not disgustingly obsequious in his support of Israel, was going to win the Iowa caucus, the Jews did what was necessary to damage his chances. That entailed having a Fox news reporter ask him if he had had sex with Rick Perry. It entailed having the Jewish Republicans disinvite Paul from their debate. And it entailed a

sudden infusion of money into Rick Santorum's campaign once he looked like a viable alternative to the fading Newt Gingrich.

Rick Santorum lost his senate race in 2006 when Catholics in Pennsylvania got tired of hearing him sing "Bomb, Bomb, Bomb, Bomb Bomb Iran," to the total exclusion of anything remotely resembling the interests of Catholics in that state—if, of course, we make an exception for the prolife issue, which Santorum was happy to trot out as a way of getting Catholic votes.

After losing the election, Rick Santorum went to work for the American Enterprise Institute, a Jewish think tank, which could now pay his salary directly. If Professor Rice is right, none of this should matter. But since it obviously does matter, what Professor Rice is proposing by telling us to pay no attention to the Jew behind the curtain is self-inflicted blindness in the name of "human dignity" which guarantees the continued failure of the Right to Life movement and the continuing death of millions of innocent preborn human beings.

Thanks to the prolife strategy articulated by Professor Rice, which bans any mention of the fact that "abortion is from the Jews" from political discourse, Catholics can be counted on to pull the Republican lever blindly in every election in which some candidate takes Jew money but claims to be prolife. Rice's strategy delivers the Catholic lambs to Republican slaughter.

If it is to be successful, any campaign to end something as evil as abortion must make use of spiritual weapons: it must work for the conversion of the group perpetrating the evil. If the Right to Life movement cannot identify that group, how can it work for its conversion? Jesus Christ tells us to love our enemies; He does not tell us to pretend that we don't have any. This admonition is *a fortiori* true of the group that constitutes the "enemies of the whole human race," namely the Jews, who also happen to be the group that gave us abortion on demand and continue to insist on its availability.

Although no one has mentioned it, Bishop Jenky adverted to the Gospel of St. John in his homily when he said:

> Remember that in past history other governments have tried to force Christians to huddle and hide only within the confines of their churches like the first disciples locked up in the Upper Room.

Once we read the Gospel passage in full, it becomes obvious why the ADL was upset, because St. John tells us that "In the evening of that same day (i.e., the first Easter Sunday) the first day of the week, the doors were closed in the room where the disciples were for fear of the Jews."

The Apostles were in hiding because of "fear of the Jews." The bishops are the successors of the Apostles. Ever since the failed experiments that were launched by *Nostra Aetate* and *Dignitatus Humanae*, the bishops have been in hiding "for fear of the Jews."

We know that God can take evil and turn it into good. As Cardinal Dolan said, "We did not ask for this fight, but we will not run from it." If the bishops want to win that fight, the formula for victory is not "religious freedom." The formula for victory can be found in the story of the first Pentecost, when the Apostles overcame their fear of the Jews and burst forth from the Upper Room and confronted the Jews of Jerusalem, saying with one voice: "You killed Jesus Christ, but God raised him to life. . . . Hearing this the Jews were cut to the heart and said to Peter and the apostles, 'What must we do, brothers?'" Peter answered them by saying, "you must repent, and every one of you must be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ."

If the bishops don't hold the Jews responsible for abortion, pornography, usury, the wars in the Middle East, and all of the other damage they have inflicted on our culture, how are they going to be "cut to the heart," and if they are not "cut to the heart," why should they stop doing what they are doing?

If the bishops do hold them responsible, there is a good chance that the Jews "will be convinced by their arguments," and that they will accept what Peter said and be baptized. Then and only then will the bloodshed stop because abortion is from the Jews.

Chapter Ten

Wall Street Rises

As some indication of the intellectual bankruptcy of what passes for conservative commentary, Rush Limbaugh accused *Dark Knight Rises* director Christopher Nolan of turning the third and final installment of his Batman trilogy into a covert attack on Republican Presidential Candidate Mitt Romney by naming the film's villain "Bane."[1] Limbaugh claimed that Bane the Villain would remind moviegoers that Romney once worked for Bain Capital; these same mindless zombies would then go to the polls and re-elect Obama for a second term. *Quod Erat Demonstratum*, as we used to say in sophomore geometry class.

If Limbaugh had dialed down his ingestion of Oxycontin a bit before heading off to the multiplex, he might have noticed something fairly obvious. Bane is the leader of the Occupy Wall Street revolutionaries in the film. Bane is also the leader of the group which shot up the New York stock exchange and took a bunch of yuppies wearing suspenders off on a mad motorcycle chase before they bounced down the highway. Nolan's film, in other words, says the exact opposite of what Rush Limbaugh claims.

Not to be outdone by Rush Limbaugh, director Christopher Nolan made even more preposterous statements in his interview with Brian Hiatt in *Rolling Stone*, when he denied that his film was "intended to convey an anti-Occupy Wall Street message" and went on to insist "that none of his Batman films are intended to be political."[2] Then to assure us that he hadn't lapsed into a drug-induced psychosis similar to the one Rush Limbaugh exhibited during his foray into film reviewing, Nolan continued by stating unequivocally: "If you're saying, 'Have you made a film that's supposed to be criticizing the Occupy Wall Street movement?'—well, obviously, that's not true."[3]

Dumbfounded by Nolan's effrontery (or mendacity), interviewer Brian Hiatt stammered, "But the movie certainly suggests that there's a great danger of populist movements being pushed too far." To which Nolan responds with even more audacity: "If the populist movement is manipulated by somebody who is evil, that surely is a criticism of the evil person. You could also say the conditions the evil person is exploiting are problematic and should be

addressed." Well, yes, you could, but then you would be describing another movie and not *Dark Knight Rises*, which gives no indication that there is any legitimacy whatsoever to the grievances of the Occupy Wall Street movement.

If there is anything more obvious than *Dark Knight Rises'* political bias, it is its unmistakable attack on the Occupy Wall Street movement. The fact that the film favored neither candidate in the upcoming election is irrelevant, primarily because when it came to any issue of significance there was no difference between the candidates. In completing the Batman trilogy Nolan has revealed his true political (or, better, economic) colors as a propagandist who goes out of his way to demonize anyone who has any objections to the current political regime. In *Dark Knight Rises*, Nolan portrays the hapless Occupy Wall Street crowd as mindless terrorist zombies who need to be destroyed by a combination of the military industrial complex, represented by the billionaire Bruce Wayne and Wayne Enterprises and all of his deadly gadgets, and the inept but nonetheless brutal New York City police department.

Nolan's film is an overly long, heavy-handed, brutalist defense of the entire cultural Gestalt of Capitalism, including sports. (To show the depths of Bane's depravity, Nolan portrays him disrupting a football game, although to his credit only after the singing of The Star-Spangled Banner. Not even Bane is evil enough to interrupt the national anthem.) In creating *Dark Knight Rises*, Nolan has given us the quintessential apocalyptic Superhero disaster film. *Dark Knight Rises* must be a defense of Capitalism because from his point of view Capitalism is the quintessence of America. If Batman wants to defend America, he has to come to the defense of Capitalism because Capitalism embodies the essence of what we are as a people. Nolan's homage to the American Military Industrial Complex and Wall Street banksters makes Leni Riefenstahl's *Triumph of the Will* look introspective and nuanced by comparison. In fact, *Dark Knight Rises* is so over the top in its defense of Capitalism and all its wretched excess that it makes Glenn Beck look like Noam Chomsky by comparison. Beck, you may recall, claimed that "Zuccotti Park smells now like an open sewer with people urinating and defecating in public . . . Let's just be honest," he continued, "They're animals."[4]

Not to be outdone by the Glenn Becks and the Bill O'Reillys at Fox News, the *New York Post* claimed that the "the Occupy Wall Street protests have devolved into a shameless display of moral depravity—with shocking (or perhaps not) interviews of protesters claiming to be getting high every day and having sex 'in a tarp' and out in plain view." As if that weren't bad enough, "creepy thugs have infiltrated the crowd of protesters camped out in Zuccotti Park for Occupy Wall Street." The *Post's* intrepid reporter then discovered "a drug addled fugitive," who was "wanted for burglary," and "said some of his hard-partying pals clued him in that the protest was a good place to be fed, get wasted and crash."

SPURIOUS CHARGES

The sex charges were as spurious as the drug charges. If anything, the sexual revolutionaries felt that Occupy Wall Street had betrayed the sacred cause of sodomy and was a "co-optation" because it refused to toe the party line on sexual issues. One of those sexual revolutionaries found OWS "overwhelmingly troubling" because "this movement" showed no interest in "radical feminism/womanism." "Where," this indignant feminist wondered, "was Occupy Wall Street even last week when SlutWalk NYC has been in the works for months?"

Dark Knight Rises is the big-screen version of Glenn Beck and the *New York Post*. Unlike Glenn Beck, who, to his credit, never claimed that the Occupy Wall Street protesters were terrorists, Nolan equips Bane and his vaguely Russian vaguely Asiatic band of thugs with AK-47s and then has them shoot up the New York Stock Exchange in a fantasy that is so over the top it would make Bill O'Reilly blush. Nolan then has Bane incite the 99 percent to rebel against the 1 percent. The Occupy Wall Street mob rushes to the upper East Side and evicts the yuppie bankers, suspenders and all, from their posh apartments, throwing their expensive furnishings onto the street and drinking their chablis in what comes across as an unintentionally funny parody of *Doctor Zhivago*. Bane then liberates all of the prisoners unjustly put in jail by Harvey Dent in a scene that is reminiscent of the storming of the Bastille. The liberated criminals put the rich on trial and condemn them to death either directly or by "exile" which means walking out onto the frozen East River until they fall through the ice. According to Nolan, this is what we all would have faced if the government had entertained any of the demands of the Occupy Wall Street protesters or if the police had not brutally shut down their protest. No, I am not kidding. No, I am not exaggerating. This is how Nolan's overheated imagination portrays the hapless, debt-burdened, unemployed graduate students who made up the overwhelming bulk of the Occupy Wall Street crowd, as I saw them with my own eyes in October 2011.

I say this not just because I was there; I say this because a random Google image search of the protest revealed photo after photo of young protesters holding up signs complaining about how much student loan debt they were burdened with and how impossible it was to find a job after completing the education that put them into debt. The Google search only confirmed what I had seen with my own eyes. If there were one theme that ran throughout the entire protest it was, as one protester claimed on his own homemade sign, that "student debt is slavery."

Instead of listening to what this young man had to say, the establishment media pulled out all of the stops in demonizing an entire generation with a legitimate grievance. Glenn Beck talked a lot about drugs and sex, but he never mentioned all the signs complaining about debt. These signs were made by young people who had been lied to. The protesters made the mistake of

believing what they were told; they had never heard of the word usury; they did not know, as Heinrich Pesch could have told them, that Capitalism is state-sponsored usury, and now they were being treated like criminals because they woke up one morning and realized that they had been tricked into unrepayable debt under the pretext of getting an education.

Christopher Nolan, one of their favorite directors, turned on them as well. If *Dark Knight Rises* proves anything, it shows that what we call Hollywood and the news media are in fact one large propaganda ministry whose job is to justify the privileges of the few by demonizing anyone who raises any objection to the system which is exploiting him. Paul Craig Roberts had something similar to say about the political process, describing it as a system which spends enormous amounts of time, energy, and money to convince the "working poor" that "standing up for America means standing up for bankster bailouts and the military/security complex's multi-trillion dollar wars."[5]

For those unfamiliar with Batman's biography, Bruce Wayne is a representative of "the military/security complex" which has given us the "multi-trillion dollar wars" in the Middle East which have bankrupted this country. Because the country is bankrupt it cannot allow students to default on their loans. Hence, the mendacity about what Occupy Wall Street was really about. Hence, the brutality of the crackdown. Hence, Nolan's movie, which disguises the fact, as Roberts puts it, that:

> The United States is ruled by a private oligarchy. The government is merely their front. The country's resources are diverted to the pockets of Wall Street, the military/security complex, and to the service of greater Israel.[6]

Roberts here hints at another common denominator which Batman, Hollywood, and Wall Street share. Batman is Jewish. Fortunately, this claim is even easier to substantiate than the claim that Occupy Wall Street was about student debt. We know that Batman is Jewish because he is a Superhero.[7] The Superhero is a Jewish fantasy that came into being during the 1930s, when young assimilationist-minded Jews like Jerry Siegel and Joe Shuster (creators of Superman in 1938) and Bob Kane (a.k.a. Robert Kahn) and Bill Finger (creators of Batman one year later) were troubled by the cognitive dissonance created by living in a wealthy country where everyone but a small wealthy minority were getting poorer by the day. Superheroes were created by American Jews who were equally troubled by the fact that virtually every Jew of their acquaintance had an explanation of America's economic crisis—namely, Marxism—which put them beyond the pale of assimilation.[8] Unlike his Marxist Jewish peers, Superman is an assimilationist Jew:

- Superman's Moses-like origin and his Midwestern WASP-ish (White Anglo-Saxon Protestant) persona are widely regarded as a symbol of Jewish assimilation. Children of immigrant Jews, Siegel and Shuster

> were not unlike many in their generation in their desire to fit in to the general *goyim* population. The creation of Superman and his alter ego Clark Kent was a manifestation of the desire by Siegel and Shuster to "pass" in mainstream population and also to assert control in a world that had often left them feeling powerless, such as when Siegel's father was murdered.[9]

According to Blair Kramer:

> Superman shared some characteristic traits with a majority of American Jews in the 1940s. Like them, he had arrived in America from a foreign world. His entire family—in fact his entire race—had been wiped out in a holocaust-like disaster on his home planet, Krypton. Like German Jewish parents who sent their children on the *kindertransports*, or the baby Moses set adrift in the bull rushes, Superman's parents launched him to Earth in hopes that he would survive. And while the mild-mannered Clark Kent held a white collar job as a reporter by day, the "real" man behind Kent's meek exterior was a virile, indestructible crusader for justice. This fantasy must have resonated among American Jews, who felt powerless to help their brethren in the death camps of Europe. Superman obeys the Talmudic injunction to do good for its own sake and heal the world where he can. Siegel and Shuster had created a mythic character who reflected their own Jewish values.[10]

According to Rabbi Simcha Weinstein and British novelist Harold Jacobson Superman's ability to fly derives from his Kryptonian name, "Kal-El" because the suffix "el," meaning "(of) God" is also found in the names of angels (e.g. Gabriel, Michael, Raphael, Ariel), who are flying humanoid agents of good with superhuman powers.[11] Superman put those powers to use for the first time during a time of economic crisis when unrepayable debt paralyzed the economy and led to a period deflation of the sort the Fed attempted to stave off by "quantitative easing." According to Superman's *Wikipedia* entry, "An influence on early Superman stories is the context of the Great Depression."[12] In 1938, when the Great Depression was heading toward the sequel to the Great War, Siegel and Shuster went to work for Harry Donenfeld and Jack Liebowitz at D. C. Comics in New York, who acted as midwives to Superman bringing out the first issue of Action Comics in June 1938. The same publishers brought Batman into existence one year later. Writing in *Ha'aretz*, Rabbi Michael Knopf claimed that Batman is one of the most Jewish superheros:[13]

> For the late comic-book artist Will Eisner, the Jewish people, faced with the rise of fascism, "needed a hero who could protect us against an almost invincible force." Jerry Siegel and Joe Shuster's Superman in 1938 was only the first and—like Bob Kane's Batman in 1939, Jack Kirby's Captain America in 1940 and many more that followed—he was created by sons of Jewish immigrants living in New York.[14]

Like Superman, Batman was a Jewish child of the Depression:

> Circa 1933, at the height of the Great Depression, a young Milton Finger changed his name to Bill Finger, as Milton, he felt, sounded too Jewish at a time when American Jews had a difficult time finding jobs. Though Finger's parents urged him to be a doctor, he resisted; Finger wanted to become an artist and a writer instead. Finger held several jobs he didn't like, until he met Bob Kane at a party and they began collaborating on comic book projects. Around the same time, Bob Kane was looking for a superhero concept to rival the hit comic Superman. Kane approached Finger for help after creating a rough sketch for a character he named "The Bat-man." Hardly enthralled, Finger redesigned the look and feel of The Bat-man's costume, and created his mask and cape. Finger also decided that rather than create an alien-born superhero like Superman, Batman would be human, vulnerable and subject to hard knocks. Kane created the name; Finger developed the concept. A deal was negotiated between Vin Sullivan, an editor at the company that would become DC Comics, and Kane to run Bat-man. While Finger was not included in the negotiations, Kane still asked him to write it. Finger then created, according to Nobleman, "a hero who looked like a villain, a vigilante who was also a detective,"[15]

The conclusion that superheroes were Jewish became inescapable when the Museum of Jewish Art and History in Paris put on an exhibition from October 17, 2007 to January 27, 2008 entitled "From Superman to the Rabbi's Cat," which explored "the impact of the Jewish experience on the evolution of the comic strip and graphic novel."[16]

The Jewish superhero is also the Antichrist. The Jews rejected Christ because he was not a powerful military leader who would restore the Kingdom by military might as David had done. The Jewish Messiah is, in other words, Superman, a caricature of the real Messiah who they rejected. The Superhero is the Jewish Messiah who brings about *tikkun olam*, the healing of the world, at a time of economic crisis, but in a non-communist way that did not jeopardize his standing as a good American. In his review of the Paris exhibition of "From Superman to the Rabbi's Cat," Jerry Iverson brought out the complexity of the Superhero's assimilationist Jewish but non-Marxist identity:

> Even as Robert Kahn had become Bob Kane and Jacob Kurtzberg worked as Jack Kirby, their superheroes reflected some of the identity they were masking, evoking Jewish concepts such as *tikkun olam* (repairing the world through social action) and legends such as the Golem of Prague, the medieval superhero of Jewish folklore who was conjured from clay by a rabbi to defend his community when it was under threat.[17]

For a brief period, the Superhero became overtly Jewish, as when Batwoman became a Jewish lesbian in 1986.[18] But Nolan's *Dark Knight Rises* is a throw-

back to the original era of the Superhero, the 1930s. Now as then the same America which prides itself on being the world's most prosperous nation is suffering through an economic crisis that had been brought on, not by foreign terrorists who "hate us because of our freedoms," but by the internal contradictions of Capitalism itself. Batman allows us to avoid the real issue by creating a Jewish fantasy that assures us that those in charge know what they are doing and have our best interests in mind, and saves us from the embarrassment of being called Communists or sex and drug crazed protesters for disagreeing with the regime. Faced with a crisis of this magnitude, someone at the propaganda ministry had to step up to the plate and defend the system that is impoverishing us. Someone had to motivate the *goyim* to support the system of Jewish usury which has enslaved them.

ODIOUS TO AMERICANS

Christopher Nolan answered that call with *Dark Knight Rises*. He knows that, as during the 1930s, it's no time to be an overtly Jewish hero, as Portnoy was in the '60s and Woody Allen was in the '70s. Contemporary Neoconservatism and its Jewish economic twin Libertarianism are every bit as odious to the Americans who know what is going on as communism was in the 1930s. The reasons are obvious. When Jewish economic geniuses like Alan Greenspan, Larry Summers, and Robert Rubin, the architects of the repeal of the Glass-Steagal Act, have ruined the economy by turning the stock exchange into one big casino for the super-rich, and when Neoconservative Jewish geniuses like Kristol *pere et fils*, Paul Wolfowitz, and Richard Perle have led us into disastrous multi-trillion dollar wars in the Middle East resulting in unrepayable debt, the Jewish superhero is better off reverting to his WASP cover identity as Bruce Wayne, the billionaire weapons manufacturing philanthropist, and riding out the storm. Let Batman and the cops beat up Bane and the Occupy Wall Street crowd as Lloyd Blankfein and Jamie Dimon look down approvingly from the boardrooms of Goldman Sachs and J.P. Morgan Chase. That's the intention behind *Dark Knight Rises,* but as we all know only God can insure a perfect fit between what we want and what we get. In producing a propaganda flick like *Dark Knight Rises*, Christopher Nolan did us all a favor by spilling the beans and letting us know who Batman is really working for.

Chapter Eleven

A Coney Island of the Mindless

I have seen the mermaids singing, each to each.
I do not think they will sing to me.

– T.S. Eliot, "The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock"

America . . .
When will you take off your clothes?

– Alan Ginsberg, "America"

. . . Montparnasse is Jewish.

– Henry Miller, Tropic of Cancer

I turned 65 in May 2013, making me officially an old man. Shortly after turning 65 I lost the pants clip that keeps my trousers out of the black greasy chain of my bicycle, and so, for a short time, until I found the pants clip again, I would travel around South Bend, Indiana wearing "the bottom of my trousers rolled," just like J. Alfred Prufrock. To do the Prufrock thing completely, I needed white flannel trousers and a beach. Well, I didn't have white flannel trousers, but in late June I was near the beach beyond the boardwalk where Coney Island meets the sea.

In 1609 Henry Hudson discovered Coney Island one day before he discovered Manhattan. The Lenape Indians who lived there called the island "Narrioch," which means "land without shadows," because the island's southeastern orientation allows the sunlight to shine on the beach all day long.[1] Coney Island received its name from the rabbits which lived there before their habitat was destroyed, but it achieved its fame as an amusement park. It is certainly an arguable proposition to claim that Coney Island is the home of the most famous beach in the United States.

Like Prufrock, I have grown old. Like Prufrock I even wear the bottom of my trousers rolled when I walk on the beach. But life is still full of surprises. Imagine Prufrock's shock, then, when, barely off the D train, he encountered a mermaid in the Coney Island Metro station. Prufrock had stumbled onto

the Coney Island Mermaid Parade. There is no fixed date for the Coney Island Mermaid Parade. It can occur at any time on the Saturday closest to the summer solstice in late June. After Hurricane Sandy, there was doubt whether it would ever occur again. The odds of stumbling across it accidentally on the way to the beach were infinitesimally small, which means that this was God's doing not mine.

The Coney Island Mermaid Parade, we are told, "is a lively and welcoming ocean-themed event opened to everyone."[2] Slightly more honestly, one of the mermaids said that the Coney Island Mermaid Parade was, "an excuse to go naked in New York City."[3] The Coney Island Mermaid Parade came into existence in 1983, nine years after the Greenwich Village Halloween Parade. It came into existence so that the mermaids "can come out as the freaks that we are and feel at home in the world."[4]

All parades in New York became in effect Gay Pride Parades the moment the courts forced the Irish who held the St. Patrick's Day Parade to admit homosexuals or not get a parade permit. The Coney Island Mermaid Parade is no exception, except that the endorsement of homosexuality, sexual deviance, and exhibitionism was more overt. Over the years of its existence the Coney Island Mermaid Parade has drawn larger and larger crowds. On the day when I attempted to get to the beach at Coney Island approximately 750,000 people had lined the streets effectively blocking my way. When the parade was over and the crowd rushed to Nathan's to buy a hot dog, it was the first time I felt threatened by the crush of a crowd since attending the 34th anniversary celebration of the Islamic revolution in Tehran. The Coney Island Mermaid Parade was the mirror image of the celebration of the 34th anniversary of the Iranian Islamic revolution. Once a year the Iranians celebrate the overthrow of the Shah and the sexual subversion he promoted. Over here, we celebrate sodomy, the triumph of sexual decadence, and the moral corruption of women. Pentheus, the ruler of Thebes, no matter what his faults were, knew that when the women leave their looms to dance naked on the mountainside, the fall of the state is imminent. On the other hand, Michael Mukasey, Brooklyn's Borough chief, announced to anyone who felt offended at the women dancing naked on the boardwalk, "if you don't like it, leave." If the *New York Times* reporter who interviewed me in Tehran had asked me to give my first impression of Coney Island, it would have been sexualization.

There is an undeniable vitality to New York City. That vitality comes from human labor. When it comes to human labor, the juice bar just west of Washington Square is the best metaphor for the New York labor market. New York City, to mix metaphors a bit, is a huge vacuum cleaner, sucking labor from every part of the United States and every part of the world. New York City is also a huge juicing machine. Like a juicing machine, it sucks the labor out of those who go there looking for work and then spits out the human pulp that is left over when the labor has been extracted. Every human being

is the fruit of the union of two other human beings. In a capitalist economy, the man with the most money gets the most fruit. Human labor lines up at the portals of New York City to be juiced. I'm not just talking about the dark-skinned immigrants who take the rich people's children for walks in the park. I'm talking about the woman sitting on the bench next to me in Washington Square telling her story to her friend. Washington Square is a place where people rest on their way to work. The woman sitting next to me is a lawyer at a high-pressure firm who has been "unhappy for ten years now" because in the process of appropriating her labor the law firm appropriated her life as well.

Her troubles began, she tells her friend, when a new partner joined the firm. The new partner felt that every client had the right to a legal brief the very next day, no matter how complicated. His advent at the firm meant that the then young lady lawyer began a series of 18-hour days which have continued to the present. She would get home at midnight and have a cheese sandwich just before going to bed for the five hours of sleep that would allow her to be at her desk the next day at 6:00 AM.

"One night," she told her friend, "I came home at midnight and was eating my cheese sandwich on the sofa when I burst into tears." Because of her hours she had not gone to a party in months; she had not met anyone as a result; as a result, she had not gotten married; she had not had children; now she was in her mid-40s and it was too late to have children. The New York Labor Juicer had sucked her dry. Paul Krugman recently opined in the *New York Times* that the capitalist labor machine is so efficient that it continually generates unemployment. As an alternative Krugman proposed a wage for everyone, whether they work or not. Not infrequently economists claim that technology makes labor obsolete, but this is clearly not the case with the 40-year-old lady lawyer sitting on the bench next to me. By allowing herself to be exploited by putting in the hours that ruined her life, she put at least two other lawyers out of work, and the surplus value which she and the two phantom employees who never got hired created went into the pockets of the partners who juiced her life.

So what happened to the two lawyers, never hired, who would have allowed this lady to lead something approximating a normal life? They most probably sold their labor at a lower price, most probably doing something they were not qualified to do, bumping someone else out of a job, and so on down the labor food chain until we reach the pool of the permanently unemployed whose role in life is to keep wages low for everyone else. In order to keep this permanently unemployed mass of human laborers from turning revolutionary, as it threatened to do at the recent Occupy Wall Street demonstrations, the state provides, as it did in the ancient world, bread and circuses. Amusement, in other words, is the flip side of the exploitation of labor I have just described. The amusement park came into being when the industrial mobilization of labor reached its peak, during the last decade of the 19th century and the first

decade of the 20th century, which was when Coney Island reached the apogee of its fame. "Coney Island," we are told, "took America from the Victorian Age into the Modern World."[5]

Taking its cue from the Columbian Exhibition in Chicago, Coney Island became a shrine to the wonders of the technological age. The railroad, which from the time Nathaniel Hawthorne immortalized it in the 1840s had become the prime artifact announcing the dawn of a new era of unlimited progress, got combined with the need for amusing the laboring masses during their limited free time when the first roller coaster was born on Coney Island in 1884.

The other technological breakthrough that made Coney Island the temple of the technological age was the incandescent light bulb. Luna Park, which was decorated with hundreds of thousands of light bulbs, was described as "an electric Eden."[6] Because its amusement parks were made of paper, plaster, and lathe, they frequently burned to the ground. By 1910, one year before Dreamland, one of the big three Coney Island amusement parks burned to the ground, Coney Island's aura was visible 30 miles out at sea. "When it was at its most popular, it perfectly reflected its culture. . . . Part of that was the excitement of electricity."[7]

The final technology, the one that enabled amusement better than any other and simultaneously doomed Coney Island as its locus, was the motion picture camera, which was invented in 1896. By the time Coney Island reached its heyday, 450 motion pictures ran simultaneously there 24 hours a day. The first pornographic film made its debut one year later.[8]

Given man's fallen nature, recreation, which is necessary to the human spirit, is forever slipping into amusement, and amusement is forever slipping into vice. No place on earth demonstrates this trajectory better than Coney Island, which was traditionally known as "Sodom on the Sea."[9] From the moment of its inception, when steam trains and ships were bringing sweltering New Yorkers there for respite from the summer heat in the 1860 and '70s, it was "a well known fact" that the picnics there were "arranged for the sole benefit of pickpockets, prostitutes, and swindlers."[10] Coney Island became a refuge from normal life. The freak shows, which always had a salacious tinge to them, preached against normality in the essential sense of the term. Coney Island preached progress, but there was no telos to human action. There was "no morality that said you had to be this way or that way." Life "was a perpetual circus."[11] Coney Island, as a result, became "a suburb of Sodom" where "scenes that shock and disgust" corrupted young people of both sexes.[12] One of the first motion pictures ever made was "Sea Waves at Coney Island." It was followed by "Cake Walk on the Beach," a film "throbbing with physical passion," at least according to the standards of the time.[13]

Soon the eroticism of the peep shows slopped over into the amusements themselves. The mechanical horse ride at Steeplechase Park became popular

because it gave young men "a chance to hug the girls. Girls like it because it gave them a chance to be hugged."[14] Even more sexually overt was the "Blowhole Theater," which greeted the young men and women as they left the Steeplechase ride. Flanked by a clown and a midget at the exit, women were forced to walk over a jet of air which blew her skirt up around her waist in front of hundreds of voyeuristic spectators who had been provided benches by the ride's owner. After the woman became an unwitting victim to the owners' desire to profit from the voyeurism of the masses, "The audience shrieked with laughter and waited for the next victim."[15]

Al Lewis, who would go on to fame as Grandpa in the TV series *The Munsters*, worked at Coney Island as a youth. His experience there taught him that "Every nation needs escape from respectability." But more sinister forces were at work. The technology of the railroad, the light bulb and the moving picture allowed Coney Island to become a laboratory in which something more sinister would be developed, namely, the technology of controlling large masses of people through the manipulation of their passions. The amusement park would provide the model for amusement as a form of control which would be perfected following World War II, when Coney Island had fallen into a period of terminal decline. Democracy got re-engineered at Coney Island. The proponents of that re-engineering claimed that "here you will find the real interpretation of the Declaration of Independence,"[16] and they may have been right. By the beginning of the 21st century, the Coney Island Freak Show had become the main explicator of tolerance, freedom, and the American Way.

After John Y. McKane, the political boss who ran Coney Island, got sent to Sing Sing for corruption, the *New York Times* claimed that "it remains to be seen whether the keepers of the resort can make their place attractive without vice."[17] The answer to that question had become a foregone conclusion. Coney Island could never break out of the mold in which it had been created as the proletarian escape valve from capitalism's pandemic exploitation of labor: "By the last decade of the 19th century . . . Coney Island exploded. A quarter of a million people could be found there on summer Sundays."[18]

HENRY MILLER'S CONEY ISLAND

Before they could fulfill their destiny as a form of mass control, amusement in general and the amusement park in particular had to find their explication at the hands of the intellectuals. On a warm September night in 1909, Sigmund Freud, author of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, visited Dreamland on Coney Island and contemplated the technological wonders and *lusi naturae* on display there. One of the people who could have bumped into Sigmund Freud on that September night was Henry Miller. Miller was born in 1891 to an alcoholic German tailor and a Puritanical German mother, whose iron will and regular

habits held the family together. Miller, whose name became synonymous with Bohemian sexual excess, never lost the orderly habits he had learned from his mother, not even in the squalor of Left Bank garrets in Montmartre and Montparnasse in the 1930s. During his teenage years, Miller become addicted to sexual vice and regularly visited prostitutes, from whom he contracted two cases of venereal disease by the time he reached his twenties.

At the age of 19, Miller began "an intensely sexual relationship with a woman who was old enough to be his mother,"[19] financed by money his family had saved to send him to college. To escape from the guilt and self-loathing that a sexual relationship of this sort invariably inspired, Miller would get up at 5:30 in the morning and "ride to Coney Island and back on the Bohemian racing wheel which he'd bought from a six-day bike rider at Madison Square Garden."[20] As Sigmund Freud could have predicted, Miller began to cathect that self-loathing on to Coney Island itself, beginning the process whereby it would become a permanent symbol of sexual degeneracy, self-loathing, and cultural disgust.

The result of that cathexis was "a Coney Island of the mind," a cultural virus which would infect the entire nation. The phrase originates, not from the book of poems by Lawrence Ferlinghetti which made it famous as part of the Beatnik craze of the 1950s, but from an essay by Miller entitled "Into the Night Life." Miller, in turn, got the phrase from "a line of Freud's which Gottfried Benn said contained the whole of modern psychology: 'Into the night life seems to be exiled what once ruled during the day.'"[21] Miller's surrealistic prose was a combination of Freudian psychoanalysis and Coney Island's Dreamland amusement park. Coney Island became saturated in Miller's sexual disgust:

> Everything is sordid, shoddy, thin as pasteboard. A Coney Island of the mind. The amusement shacks are running full blast, the shelves full of chinaware and dolls stuffed with straw and alarm clocks and spittoons. Every shop has three balls over it and every game is a ball game. The Jews are walking around in the mackintoshes, the Japs are smiling, the air is full of chopped onions and sizzling hamburgers.[22]

In Miller's mind, Coney Island had become a symbol of America, corrupt and superficial, but before long, it becomes equally clear that America had become a stand-in for lost innocence, both national and personal, because capitalism goes hand in hand with moral corruption and "creative destruction":

> In the oceanic night Steeplechase looks like a wintry beard. Everything is sliding and crumbling, everything glitters, totters, teeters, titters. . . . Where is the warm summer's day when I first saw the green-carpeted earth revolving and men and women moving like panthers? Where is the soft gurgling music which I heard welling up from the sappy roots of earth? Where am I to go if everywhere there are trapdoors and grinning

> skeletons, a world turned inside out and all the flesh peeled off? Where am I to lay my head if there is nothing but beards and mackintoshes and peanut whistles and broken slats? Am I to walk forever along this endless pasteboard street, this pasteboard which I can punch a hole in, which I can blow down with my breath, which I can set fire to with a match? The world has become a mystic maze erected by a gang of carpenters during the night. Everything is a lie, a fake. Pasteboard.[23]

Disgust mingled with nostalgia:

> Under the elevated structure, the windows full of pies and hamburgers, the rails swiftly turning, the old sensations, the old memories invade me again. All that belongs with docks and wharves, with funnels, cranes, pistons, wheels, ties, bridges, all the paraphernalia of travel and hunger repeats itself like a blind mechanism.[24]

Confronted with a moral challenge of this magnitude, Miller can either repent or press on. Since Cora, the girl of his dreams, has been lost forever to marriage to another man, Miller takes on the persona of the Promethean liberator, walking along the ocean front, contemplating the beach, which "is strewn with human clams waiting for someone to pry their shells apart."[25]

In order to accomplish his mission of liberation through depravity, Miller would eventually leave his native New York for Paris, where Bohemia because of the world wide economic crisis, had fallen on hard times in comparison with the halcyon last days of the *belle epoque*. The dubious fruit of Miller's stay in Paris in the 1930s was the pornographic novel *Tropic of Cancer*, a *succès de scandale* that attracted the attention of the *tout le monde literaire*, including such improbable admirers as T. S. Eliot. Samuel Beckett called *Tropic of Cancer* "a momentous event in the history of modern writing."[26] In his typically effusive manner whenever pornography was involved, Norman Mailer called it "one of the ten or 20 greatest novels of our century, a revolution in consciousness equal to *The Sun Also Rises*."[27]

While in Paris, Miller discovered that to be a Bohemian meant becoming Jewish. Montparnasse was Jewish; the transformation had taken place long before Miller arrived, under the auspices of Picasso's dealer Kahnweiler and painters like Modigliani, who introduced himself to the English painter Nina Hamnett when she arrived in Montparnasse as "Modigliani, painter and Jew."[28] As Miller put it in *Tropic of Cancer*, "almost all Montparnasse is Jewish, or half-Jewish, which is worse. . . . Frances Blake is a Jew or a Jewess. Titus is a Jew. The Jews then are snowing me under. I am writing this for my friend Carl whose father is a Jew. All this is important to understand."[29] By becoming a Bohemian, Miller had become a Jew. In describing his infatuation with the Jewess Tania, Miller writes: "for her sake I too would become a Jew. Why not? I already speak like a Jew. And I am as ugly as a Jew. Besides, who hates the Jews more than a Jew?"[30]

Sodom by the Sea suffered the fate of its biblical namesake more than once. Dreamland, as we have already mentioned, burned to the ground in 1911, two years after Sigmund Freud's visit. After World War II, the "creative destruction" continued apace. Luna Park burned down in 1944, reopened briefly and then closed forever two years later. Robert Moses hated Coney Island's noise and squalor and vowed to clean it up with the high rise buildings which the Beats, taking their cue from Miller, condemned as part of the "air-conditioned nightmare" that America was on its way to becoming at the time. With decay came a kind of efflorescence. Coney Island experienced its greatest influx of visitors on Friday, July 4, 1947, when 1,300,000 New Yorkers, or one fifth of the entire population of the city, went to the beach. Three years later, in spite of the ongoing decay, or perhaps because of it, Bettie Page began her career as the world's most famous pin-up model by simply walking along the boardwalk on Coney Island, where she was discovered by a full-time cop and part-time photographer by the name of Jerry Tibbs.[31] Bettie Page would go on to pose for some 20,000 photos before she succumbed to the psychosis which playing the role of sexual icon eventually engendered.[32]

The beach will always attract people on a hot day, but the amusement park era was rapidly drawing to a close:

> After World War II, contraction began seriously from a number of pressures. Air conditioning in movie theaters and then in homes, along with the advent of automobiles which provided access to the less crowded and more appealing Long Island state parks, especially Jones Beach State Park, lessened the attractions of Coney Island's beaches. Luna Park closed in 1946 after a series of fires, and the New York street gang problems of the 1950s spilled into Coney Island. The presence of threatening youths did not impact the beach-goers, but discouraged visitors to the rides and concessions which were staples of the Coney Island economy. The local economy was dealt a severe blow by the 1964 closing of Steeplechase Park the last of the major amusement parks.[33]

Then the real catastrophe occurred. Shortly after World War II, the literary Jew boys discovered Miller and made him, and by extension Coney Island, the stylistic paradigm of modern American literature. Coney Island had been weaponized by becoming "a Coney Island of the mind." Karl Shapiro, who could serve as the classic example of one of New York's literary *Judenbuben*, suggested that he and Lawrence Durrell should "'put together a bible of Miller's work' to be substituted for the Gideon Bible in every hotel room in America."[34] This is, of course, precisely what happened—if not literally then certainly substantively. Sexual decadence became the new Bible, and every parade became a gay pride parade.

By the time Lawrence Ferlighetti, a Sephardic Jew who grew up in New York, issued a book of poetry entitled *A Coney Island of the Mind* in 1958,

Coney Island had become a symbol of decadent sleaze, and that was precisely why the *Judenbuben* liked it so much. When Ferlinghetti issued his book in the mid-50s the transformation was complete. Lifting the title of his book from Miller's description in his Freudian, surrealist essay "Into the Night Life," Ferlinghetti's poetry was simply Miller's prose splayed across the page in ways that disguised its lack of meter. Under the auspices of Ferlighetti and Allen Ginsberg and Norman Mailer, the island where the Dutch used to hunt rabbits became:

> '. . . a kind of Coney Island of the mind, a kind of circus of the soul.' Indeed both Miller and Ferlinghetti hit on the idea of letting go, of giving in to your senses. They suggest we should embrace the chaos of the carnivalesque, the overstimulated bawdiness of the burlesque. And they evoke moments when we may have no choice otherwise.[35]

Ferlinghetti used Miller's style as a cover for Jewish blasphemy. In one of his poems from *A Coney Island of the Mind*, he describes Jesus Christ on the Cross as:

Him just hang there
On His tree
Looking real Petered out
And real cool
And also
According to a round up
of late world news
from the usual reliable sources
real dead.[36]

A Coney Island of the Mind is the mechanism which reduces everything human and/or sacred to something freakish, campy, and ultimately dismissible:

This life is not a circus where
the shy performing dogs of love
look on
Yet gay parading floats drift by
While cakewalkers and carnie hustlers
All gassed to the gills
Strike playbill poses
And stagger after every
Wheeling thing
While still around the ring
Lope the misshapen camels of lust
And all us Emmett Kelly clowns
Always making up imaginary scenes
With all our masks for faces

Even eat fake Last Suppers
At collapsible tables
And mocking ourselves
In saw dust crosses
And yet gobble up at last
To shrive our circus souls
The also imaginary
Wafers of grace.[37]

The main force driving Miller's reputation among the Jewish literati in New York was *Tropic of Cancer*, Miller's pornographic *tour de force* describing his life among the lice-ridden whores of Paris during the 1930s. The Jew Boys from New York City had unilaterally declared Henry Miller the new literary Messiah. Miller "took off at the place where Hemingway ended."[38] Henry Miller, Norman Mailer continued:

> has influenced the style of half the good American poets and writers alive today: it is fair to ask if books as different as *Naked Lunch*, *Portnoy's Complaint*, *Fear of Flying*, and *Why Are We in Vietnam?* would have been as well-received (or as free in style) without the irrigation Henry Miller gave to American prose. . . . With the exception of Hemingway he has had perhaps the largest stylistic influence of an 20th century American author.[39]

Mailer is right. During the second half of the 20th century, American literature ended up in the garbage can largely because of Henry Miller and his Jewish acolytes. Allen Ginsberg's poetry reads like a bad imitation of Henry Miller's prose. It has the same unfortunate combination of sexual deviance taking refuge behind high moral indignation, as when he wrote in the poem of the same name: "America when will you be angelic?/When will you take off your clothes?"

Miller knew he was spewing cultural poison when he wrote *Tropic of Cancer*. What he came to understand later is that this poison was seen as a valuable commodity because it anesthetized its readers to the extent of their depravity:

> One reason why I have stressed so much the immoral, the wicked, the ugly, the cruel in my work is because I wanted others to know how valuable these are, how equally if not more important than the good things . . . I was getting the poison out of my system. Curiously enough, this poison had a tonic effect for others. It was as if I had given them some kind of immunity.[40]

Eventually the *Judenbuben* from New York City, Miller's *Tropic of Cancer*, and the work of epigoni like Ferlinghetti and Ginsberg combined to overturn the nation's obscenity laws. One day after Ferlinghetti heard "Howl" for the

first time, he wired Ginsberg a telegram saying: "I greet you at the beginning of a great literary career." It was the same line that Emerson had sent to Walt Whitman after the former had read *Leaves of Grass*. The reaction of the police was anything but flattering. In 1956 San Francisco police confiscated copies of "Howl" and Shig Murao, the bookstore manager, was arrested on obscenity charges. Ferlingetti went on trial, but was eventually acquitted thanks to the efforts of Jake Ehrlich and the American Civil Liberties Union, the Jewish organization that was then in the forefront of striking down obscenity laws. The judiciary followed the ACLU's lead. Judge Clayton W. Horn declared that "Howl" was not obscene, and Ginsberg was acquitted in October 1957.[41] In 1964 the United States Supreme Court declared that *Tropic of Cancer* wasn't obscene either.[42]

What followed was moral deregulation not just in sexual issues, but across the board. The prime beneficiaries were the Wall Street Usurers. The Jewish-led sexual revolution, which began when Hollywood overturned the essentially Catholic production code over a two-year period of time beginning with the release of *The Pawnbroker* in 1965 and ending with the release *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* in 1967, found its culmination in the de-criminalization of abortion in 1973, but the point of sexual liberation was ultimately economic. The culmination of the sexual revolution was the Monetary Control Act of 1980. The decriminalization of usury which occurred with the passage of the Monetary Control Act of 1980 was only the logical extension of the wave of moral "liberation" which began with the sexual revolution. Greider sees the same connection:

> For some years, American society had been engaged in an era of moral liberation. . . . The Catholic sin [*sic*] of abortion was legalized. . . . Moral inhibitions that had held authority for centuries were abandoned. Old notions of sinfulness were redefined as largely private matters, no longer subject to public regulation. . . . In this climate of moral change, American finance was also liberated to do what had once been forbidden. This sin of usury was legalized by an act of Congress.[43]

Unlike the reaction to abortion, which would propel Ronald Reagan into the White House in 1980, there was no controversy surrounding the decriminalization of usury. The same rhetoric would be applied to both liberations: "Lending money at ruinous rates would now be regarded, like sex, as a 'victimless crime,' a private act between consenting adults."[44] Since the traditional moral condemnation of usury was always at odds with the dynamics of capitalism, which was always state-sponsored usury, any erosion of morals was going to be good for capitalism. Viewed in this light, the sexual revolution can be seen as the first phase of a plan of moral deregulation whose ultimate goal was freeing the capitalist system of the last vestiges of

moral restraint. With the passage of the Monetary Act of 1980, that goal was achieved. The moral poles had been reversed:

> Creditors were now portrayed in the political debate as the victims, the virtuous citizens who were exploited by the political interference. Borrowers were described as morally suspect. . . . The original social contract implied by the concept of usury—the obligations of wealth toward the needs of others—was inverted. The congressional debate described a new political obligation: the savers must be set free, free to seek the highest rate of return on their money.[45]

Once the Fed started paying over 20 percent on T-bills, usury statutes became meaningless because the entire economy had to follow the Fed's lead. Banks which borrowed from the Fed at record high rates had to charge their customers even higher rates to make a profit. In *Secrets of the Temple: How the Federal Reserve Runs the Country*, William Greider claims that "the moral offence" involved in usury "was profit without work. The usurer sold time, which belonged only to God."[46] But by the 1980s, the religious terminology was all on the side of the usurer. When Paul Volcker and other defenders of usury referred to their attempts to return to the pre-Keynesia era of hard money, they invariably referred to "suffering" of the salutary sort that took place in "purgatory." Hard money was the "old-time religion" that needed to be brought back to pay for the Keynesian binge. According to David Stockman, Reagan's director of the Office of Budget Management, "The president would say to us: 'We've been on a binge for 30 years. This is the price you have to pay'"[47] according to the "old time religion."

Greider claims that "The payment of interest was the core of the capitalist dynamic—it mobilized idle wealth for productive enterprises,"[48] but in pointing out the errors of the usurers, Greider often can't distinguish between the Ten Commandments and the golden calf, as when he writes:

> The advocates of gold relied upon divine authority to enforce this natural order. If humankind pledged obedience to God's indestructible metal, it would be rewarded with eternal assurance of stability. Both doctrines, gold and monetarism, were expressions of pre-modernist fundamentalism, simple and certain moral formulas for life, and their certitude had deep appeal, especially in anxious times.[49]

If the gold standard is orthodoxy, then Keynes can certainly be described as a heretic, but the terms are deceptive because the real orthodoxy in both moral and economic matters preceded the gold standard. Greider fails to grasp the paradox at the heart of Keynesianism when the claims that Keynes and his followers:

> claimed that men and women could responsibly manage human affairs for themselves. They were rationalists who dismissed the "old-time

> religion" and its false moral commandments. Universal human pleasure, Keynes announced, did not require a requisite measure of Calvinist pain. It required the application of human intelligence.[50]

Human intelligence may or may not be able to bring about "universal human pleasure" (whatever that means), but it can only bring about a sound economy through the application of practical reason, which is to say universal norms which proscribe anti-social behavior like usury.

Advocates of the real "old time religion," like St. Antonino of Florence, would counter Greider's argument by saying that usury on loans was the antithesis of productive investment (and charity), because, unlike equity investments, there was no shared risk on a loan. Even the guardians of the rentier class understood this. Fed Governor Charles Partee pointed out "the fundamental difference between equity and debt" when he claimed that: "You are not required to pay a dividend to stockholders if your profits are down. But if you don't service your debt, you go bankrupt."[51] This became painfully apparent during the leveraged buy-out frenzy of the 1980s, when equity got exchanged for debt on a massive scale with devastating consequences for America's manufacturing sector, as one corporation after another failed because it had been saddled with more debt than it could sustain.

In 1984, at the height of the LBO frenzy, American corporations turned $72 billion in stock shares into debt.[52] Much of that money got siphoned off into exorbitant fees for the managers of the deals. Next to nothing got invested to make the companies more productive. It was one more instance of usury facilitating the looting of American labor.

When Congress enacted the Monetary Control Act of 1980, "State usury laws—which prohibited interest rates from rising above acceptable levels—were unilaterally suspended by act of Congress." The suspension of usury laws would prove to be a disaster for small businesses and the working man, but the high interest rates it allowed proved to be a boon for the banks:

> The Monetary Control Act of 1980 represented a major tax cut for the banks, totaling many billions of dollars. When the new rules were fully phased in, the member banks would be freed of nearly $14.5 billion in reserve requirements—money that they could then invest at market rates.[53]

The winners were the big banks, which suddenly had billions of their assets freed up at precisely the moment that the government was paying unprecedentedly high interest rates. Many of the legislators who passed the Monetary Control Act of 1980 profited from it financially. The banks contributed generously to the campaigns of their congressional supporters, but beyond that more than one-fourth of the Congressmen who passed the bill had a direct financial stake in the outcome. Ownership of stock in financial institution among

congressmen "exceeded their holdings in manufacturing, law, arms, or oil and gas."[54]

On January 20, 1981, Ronald Reagan was inaugurated President of the United States, and on the same day, the Iranian hostage crisis ended. The link between the two events was not coincidental. The Reagan campaign had bribed the imams to prolong the hostage crisis as a way of embarrassing Jimmy Carter and winning the election.

Ronald Reagan then set out to implement the same economic theories that Paul Volcker was implementing at the Fed. "Reagan," according to Greider, "was the first modern president who could fairly be labeled a monetarist. He was a disciple of Milton Friedman's."[55] He knew, therefore, that another word for driving down inflation was increasing unemployment. As a result, it didn't take Reagan long to declare war on labor. When 13,000 members of the Professional Air Traffic Controllers Organization walked off the job on August 3, 1981, Reagan was handed his *causus belli* on a silver platter. That afternoon, Reagan announced that the strikers had 48 hours to return to work or face termination.[56] After courting the union's support during the 1980 presidential election campaign and commiserating with them over their long hours and low pay,[57] Reagan responded to PATCO's strike by turning the power of the federal government against the union, firing 11,000 strikers and ordering the Justice Department to indict 75 of the union's leaders. A federal judge complemented Reagan's work by imposing fines of $1 million per day for the duration of the strike. Faced with this government fire-power, the strike collapsed; the union was ultimately decertified, and a warning went out to organized labor that the New Deal was officially over:

> By the 1980s, the New Deal reforms that protected labor and agriculture had already lost their effectiveness. . . . Labor unions . . . had also lost much of their power to control access to jobs. Corporations, facing their own cost squeeze on profits, had discovered how to escape the wage demands of organized labor. They simply moved the factories away from the unions. Manufacturing jobs were relocated first, from the industrial North to the underdeveloped South, where willing workers accepted lower wages and the absence of union protection. Next, the jobs were moved overseas to low-wage countries around the world.[58]

Widespread acceptance of Friedman's Chicago School economic theories enabled the American government to attack labor in the United States, just as it had enabled the attacks on labor that immediately followed the installation of Friedmanite dictatorships in countries like Chile and Argentina. Caught in a crossfire between the Fed and the White House, labor lost all of the gains it had made during the Keynesian/New Deal era. From the Friedmanite perspective, the war on inflation and the war on labor were two sides of the same coin. As a result of declaring war on inflation, "Volcker wanted wages

to fall, the faster the better. In crude terms, the Fed was determined to break labor."[59]

GINSBERG ON WALL STREET

In *The Fatal Embrace: Jews and the State*, Benjamin Ginsberg told the '80s Wall Street story from a slightly different perspective. According to Ginsberg, "It apparently did not go unnoticed in executive suites across the country that virtually all the takeover specialists and their financial backers were Jews."[60] Martin and Charlie Sheen played characters which were identifiably Catholic in *Wall Street*, but Gordon Gecko was never identified as a Jew even though all the "rapacious leveraged-buyout kings of the 1980s" were overwhelmingly Jewish. Or, as Ginsberg puts it in *Fatal Embrace*,

> Such Jewish financiers as Saul Steinberg, Victor Posner, Carl Icahn, Nelson Pelz, the Belzberg family, Sir James Goldsmith and others were among the leaders in hostile takeover efforts. Of the major actors in the area of corporate takeovers, only two—T. Boone Pickens and Cincinnati-based Carl Lindner—were not Jews. Jewish arbitrageurs—Ivan Boesky came to be the most famous—became major factors in the acquisition of huge blocks of stock, easing the way for takeover attempts. Jews pioneered program trading that, among other things permitted corporations to aggregate excess revenues in their pension funds that could then be employed for other corporate purposes.[61]

Ginsberg claims that the Reagan Administration arranged this "marriage of convenience" largely to pursue foreign policy goals and then reneged on the arrangement when it became politically inconvenient. Be that as it may, junk bonds were a Jewish invention because:

> The parvenu Jews saw the incredible possibilities inherent in the junk bonds that established firms disdained. The Jews honed the art of risk arbitrage, another field snubbed by WASP Wall Street.[62]

In an unprecedented reversal of political roles,

> the Jewish financier enjoyed the blessing and protection of the Reagan administration. The administration courted the financiers and protected them from a hostile congress.[63]

The Democratic Party was the traditional political home of the Jews, who earn like Episcopalians but vote like Puerto Ricans, but because the Democrats were beholden to the unions, they could not ignore the wreckage which leveraged buyouts were causing in the economy. They could also not ignore the anti-union bias of the private equity firms or the toll in lost jobs they were causing. The toll was enormous indeed. Just two years of corporate takeovers, those which took place between 1985 and 1986, wiped out "one-fourth of the corporations that had been listed in the Fortune 500" and the jobs of everyone

who worked for them.[64] And in 1986 it looked as if the worst was yet to come. As a result the Democrats turned on the Jews, or as Ginsberg put it:

> Many of Reagan's opponents in the Democratic party and the liberal media understood that it was the de facto alliance between the administration and the Jewish financiers that made sufficient money and credit available to fuel economic expansion despite the huge budget deficits that would have otherwise diminished the availability of capital to private concerns. . . . By attacking the activities of the Jewish financiers, Democrats hoped to disrupt Reagan's economic policies, which were damaging their own constituents.[65]

When it became apparent that the Reagan administration could not protect its Jewish financiers, they were cut loose from White House protection and began turning on each other. Dennis Levine, "a managing director at Drexel Burnham Lambert and a close associate of many of the major Jewish financiers . . . agreed to cooperate with federal authorities and led investigators to Ivan Boesky. Boesky, in turn, led prosecutors to a number of others, including, most importantly, Michael Milken."[66] After Milken was indicted, Drexel Burnham Lambert was forced into bankruptcy, and the leveraged buy-era came to an abrupt end as criminal investigations became "weapons in partisan warfare."[67]

By 1987 the government felt that it had to intervene. In October 1987, the same year that *Wall Street* appeared in the nation's theaters, House Ways and Means committee chairman Dan Rostenkowski closed the last big leveraged buy-out loophole, causing the Dow Jones Industrial average to fall 23 percent, the largest one-day decline in the history of the stock market. By 1989 nine Congressional hearings were planned on the impact of leveraged buyouts. The bad news was undeniable: "Of the 25 companies that from 1985 to 1989 borrowed $1 billion or more in junk bonds to finance their own LBOs, 52 percent, including wallboard maker National Gypsum, eventually collapsed."[68]

FAILED EFFORT

Rostenkowski's effort to reign in the leveraged buyout kings failed. During the 1980s, Congress "considered taking bold action," but "In the end no major changes were made."[69] In *The Buyout of America: How Private Equity Will Cause the Next Great Credit Crisis*, Josh Kosman tells us that "In the early 1990s the LBO kings disappeared from public view,"[70] but the change was more semantic than financial. The change "from leveraged buyout to management buyout to private equity . . . was really a marketing concept."[71] The Fed's willingness to keep the cheap money spigot turned on insured that predatory take-overs would continue, no matter what they were called. Banks were competing with each other to get LBO business.

There are other reasons why this issue did not get resolved. One was because of the connection between Private Equity buyouts and demographics,

or as Kosman put it, "State pensions . . . needed higher returns to pay all of the soon-to-be retiring Baby Boomers."[72] Pension managers needed higher returns because their clients were retiring, and younger workers were not replacing them. By 2006, 51 of 64 state pensions were underfunded, compared with only 25 in 2000. "From 1997 through 2007, the $24 billion Employees Retirement System of Texas had seen a 17 percent fall in active members and an 85 percent rise in retirees."[73]

Sensing that he had the upper hand over pension fund managers, Henry Kravis starting flying them to KKR headquarters in his private jet and tying up their money in long-term contracts that benefited KKR. Because demographics were upside down, Kravis could take advantage of what Kosman characterizes as "a huge pool of investment money competing for opportunities."[74] Pension funds were practically begging private equity firms like KKR to take their money, and people like Henry Kravis were only too eager to oblige, often tying up pension fund money for a decade into the future, even as returns began dwindling. Kravis knew that he had the pension funds by the short hairs, largely because of the cheap money which Federal Reserve Board Chairman Alan Greenspan continued to make available at public expense. Greenspan's collusion with the plutocrats is just one of many ugly stories which comes out in the private equity saga. If the Fed had raised interest rates to where they were in the early '90s, the pension fund managers could have bought T-bills, and predatory middlemen like Kohlberg and Kravis would have been eliminated from the equation. Instead, Greenspan chose to act in their interest by keeping the cheap money spigot open.

DICK ZIGUN

Dick Zigun founded the Coney Island Mermaid Parade in 1983, long after anyone in his right mind could consider a novel, much less a poem, obscene but just as the leveraged buy-out frenzy was reaching a peak on Wall Street. Zigun was born in 1953, raised in Bridgeport, Connecticut, hometown of P.T. Barnum, and received an MFA from the Yale School of Drama and many NEA grants.[75] Zigun was raised an Orthodox Jew, but he described himself as an agnostic. His deconversion from Judaism began when he attended Expo '67, the world's fair in Montreal. Zigun, who would become the un-official mayor of Coney Island, recognized the religious implications of Coney Island-like exhibitions. He described the world's fair in Montreal as "a mind-blowing experience." The interviewer from the *Jewish Forward* described the effect of Montreal's Expo '67 on his religious views:

> Thanks to Expo's state-of-the-art science and cutting-edge technology, religion no longer had any traction for him. Prayer and praise didn't make sense. Despite good relations with his family, gatherings became difficult when they centered on Jewish rituals and on synagogue attendance.[76]

Zigun is described as "married to a pop musician from Lagos, Nigeria," but the gender of Zigun's wife or "wife" is not specified. Maybe it doesn't matter anymore because all of us are now Jews and homosexuals, and even if we aren't really, we're expected to act the parts. We're all supposed to emulate people like Dick Zigun, who found his true vocation in corrupting the morals and the mores of the American culture which has treated him so well. Who could not, after all, be envious of Zigun's political clout and the fact that he could count on the support of New York Mayor Michael Bloomberg, as well as generous government stimulus packages to implement what he calls "amusement park socialism?"[77]

Is it surprising that "amusement park socialism" has a distinctly Reichean, sexual-revolutionary tinge to it? No, not at all. Nor is it surprising that "amusement park socialism" is compatible with the most ruthless form of capitalism, which is to say, Jewish capitalism. The two have been bedfellows ever since Jacob Schiff gave Trotsky a ship laden with gold and told him to put it to good use in overthrowing the Czar.

Nor is it surprising that the Coney Island Mermaid Parade would begin at the height of Wall Street's leveraged buyout craze. Ten years after the advent of feminism, law schools were churning out women who would throw themselves voluntarily into the capitalist volcano in exchange for narcissistic fantasies that would console them in the absence of children and fulfilled lives. Abortion weaponized a whole generation of women. When the feminist lawyers woke up to the fact that they had ruined their lives irrevocably, Dick Zigun was on hand to turn them into mermaids.

Just in case there is any doubt left in anyone's mind about the Jewish role in this trajectory of cultural decay, Joe Biden announced in mid-June that the Jews were behind gay marriage, the latest manifestation of cultural decadence. Two days after Prufrock watched the mermaids dance naked on the Coney Island boardwalk, the Supreme Court of the United States overturned the Defense of Marriage Act. The Jewish press bragged that this act of antidemocratic cultural terrorism was orchestrated by Jews, in particular Jewish women, led by Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg:

> It's probably not an accident that the four Justices who were most critical of DOMA are all either women or Jews—and in the case of Ginsburg and her colleague Elena Kagan, both. It is, however, a total coincidence that the plaintiff in the case, Edith Windsor and her lawyer, Roberta Kaplan, are also both Jewish women. And it may make no substantive difference in the end: the vote that matters in the case belongs to Anthony Kennedy, a committed Catholic who nevertheless has written the Court's opinions in the two major gay-rights decisions, 1996's Romer v. Evans, which invalidated a Colorado ballot measure voiding gay-rights laws, and 2003's Lawrence v. Texas, which struck down laws criminalizing sodomy in the 13 other states where they remained on the books.[78]

As Pentheus discovered a long time ago, as soon as the women leave their looms and dance naked on the mountainside, the state is doomed. The same fate applies when mermaids dance naked on the Coney Island boardwalk.

Chapter Twelve

Airhead Generation

America-Lite is simultaneously a book about the culture wars, a co-optation of the concept of culture wars, and a good example of why those wars ended in defeat for those who signed on to fight them in the early '90s, as I did when I founded *Culture Wars* magazine.

The book begins with a long litany of how good things were as late as 1957, when Yale Dean William Devane claimed that our scientists and engineers were "the wonder and envy of other nations,"[1] and how bad things are now. Before the cultural revolution, "it was taken for granted that instilling patriotism was a duty of every U.S. public school." Before the cultural revolution, "America was assumed to be a Christian or a Judeo-Christian society." Before the cultural revolution, "access to birth control was restricted, in theory, to married couples. The legal status of abortion was regulated separately by each state." And most importantly, before the cultural revolution, "you wore white in the courts."[2]

"The cultural revolution," Gelernter concludes in his most elegaic manner, "swept it all away."[3] Here, I thought, is a culture warrior after my own heart, but before long nagging questions formed in the back of my mind. If Digby Baltzell could accuse Irish Catholics of wrecking tennis in the '70s, are we allowed to ask questions like "which group of people overturned abortion laws in California and New York?"

Similarly, when I read that "the cultural revolution and its consequences promoted the destruction of privacy; in fact, the whole idea of privacy. The Internet, too, makes it easy to party naked,"[4] I found myself asking, "which group of people is responsible for pornography on the Internet and/or the culture of domestic spying created by the NSA and Homeland Security?" Didn't Homeland Security hire Markus Wolf, former head of the East German Stasi, as one of its consultants? Do Markus Wolf and Michael Chertoff have something in common? Are they both "intellectuals"?

To make his narrative plausible, Gelernter must find a villain. This poses an immediate problem. If he follows the line of his own reasoning and chooses—as he lectures us many times in his narrative—facts instead of theories, the

evidence becomes inescapable. The Jews were responsible for the cultural revolution of the '60s.

This inescapable conclusion unfortunately destroys the political framework of his book—namely, conservative equals good and liberal equals bad—so he has to create a fictional persona to hold responsible for the evils he has documented. The villain in this Manichean melodrama is the PORGI, the successor to the WASP:

> Before [the cultural revolution of the '60s], it [Yale] was basically conservative, as the old-time WASP elite . . . had always been; after, it was left-liberal as the intelligentsia had always been. To put it differently, WASPs were replaced at the helm of American culture by PORGIs—post-religious, globalist intellectuals.[5]

David Brooks tried the same maneuver with considerably better prose years ago when he wrote about, BoBos, i.e., the Bohemian Bourgeois who became the cultural elites during the 1980s. After expounding his thesis at a book signing promoting *Bobos in Paradise*, Brooks was nonplussed when a woman came up to him and asked, "Aren't you really talking about Jews?"

The same question needs to be asked of Professor Gelernter. When you create the fiction of the PORGI, aren't you really talking about the people whom Stalin, who also needed circumlocutions, would have called "rootless cosmopolitans," i.e., Jews?

The more Gelernter attempts to define PORGIs, the more it sounds as if he is talking about Jews: "PORGIs," he tells us, "see themselves as separate by a cultural Grand Canyon from the nation at large."[6] Later he says that PORGIs "have come out on top. . . . they wound up as captains of the supertanker of U.S. culture, charting its course—and despising the nation at large as much as the nation had despised them. . . . . Those once despised by the nation's intellectuals are now running Harvard."[7] The only way this statement makes sense is if PORGI is a code word for Jew.

The list of instances demonstrating Gelernter's deliberate blindness when it comes to the true perpetrators of the cultural revolution goes on and on. Gelernter claims that the Black Panthers were "terrorists and thugs."[8] What he doesn't tell us is that they were supported by Jews like David Horowitz and Bert Schneider, the Jewish producer of *Easy Rider*. The Black Panthers were a latter day version of the NAACP, which is to say a Jewish-run Negro front group. Gelernter complains about political correctness but fails to see that it too is a Jewish invention and that it found its classical expression in Stanley Fish's essay "Why there is no such thing as free speech and why this is a good thing." Deborah Lipstadt, as I have pointed out, is a Jewish commissar masquerading as a professor.

Ever the intrepid culture warrior, Gelernter complains that "Bill Clinton's proposals to allow openly homosexual servicemen in the armed forces

generated aggressive criticism in 1993"[9] without telling us that Clinton's decision came about as a result of pressure from the Jewish homosexual David Geffen. Similarly, Gelernter complains about the gay marriage campaign—"Where is the social impact statement regarding homosexual marriage?"[10]—with no recognition of the fact that, as Vice President Biden pointed out, the Jews are behind gay marriage every bit as much as they were behind gays in the military. His question "might a change in the definition of marriage gratify a smallish minority but bring grief in the long term to many more people over many generations?" takes on new meaning in light of that fact. Gelernter's rhetorical questions go on and on in the same vein, as when he asks, "Why should a nation that has grown so monumentally cautious when it comes to meddling with nature meddle so recklessly with society?" without any recognition that the answer to this rhetorical question about gay marriage and other battles in the culture wars is: "Because the culture is controlled by Jews."

Conservatism, at least as Gelernter construes it, is a front for Jewish interests. The co-optation becomes evident when Gelernter finally gets around to defining "Americanism," which he defined in another book as "the world's fourth great religion." Americanism, according to Gelernter is based on "liberty, equality, democracy, and American Zionism: America as the promised land, the shining city on a hill, a nation tasked by God to be a beacon to the world; to be the world's only biblical republic."[11] The real America, in other words, is Jewish. America is a Jewish construct; to become truly American we have to become Jewish. The fact that Puritans were judaizers is supposed to lend intellectual credibility to this thesis. America is still the propositional nation; after the cultural revolution of the 1960s, however, the proposition took on new virulence because of the increasingly prominent role which Jews played in controlling the culture via their occupation of the chokepoints in the media. The American Proposition then morphed into something that was simultaneously monstrous, preposterous, and quintessentially Jewish, as when Gelernter opines:

> The Second World War provided, at long last, the historical vindication that Judeo-Christian religion had sought unsuccessfully for two thousand years[!]. Two Christian nations [England and US] saved the world while two pagan nations plumbed the lowest depths of hell.[12]

"America had a mission." To back up his claim, Professor Gelernter, who teaches computer science at Yale, cites Andre Malraux, who claimed in 1962 that America's "exceptional energy and organization have never been oriented to conquest."[13] In light of the spate of neoconservative inspired wars in the Middle East, the claim comes across as more than slightly absurd, but Gelernter makes it anyway.

What then caused America to crumble? Gelernter tries his hand first at Freudian psychoanalysis to explain what happened. It was the national version of Oedipal hatred of the father:

> Of course, I have already named a cause. . . . America was a thriving, powerful, exuberant, virile blooming nation in the 1950s and early '60s, and young Americans . . . were haunted by their fathers' monumental achievement in making it so. And the sullen, swaggering Iagos felt stifled, and jealous of what their fathers had done without their help: in the Second World War, those fathers had beaten out the very fires of hell. No feat could stand beside that without seeming small, and who would ever admire them as their fathers had been admired.[14]

But, ultimately, it wasn't the baby boomers who destroyed us, it was "the intellectuals." "Patriotism has been beaten bloody and the family is on the ropes. It has been a great epoch for American intellectuals."[15] *America-Lite* is a rehash of Brenda's 1928 tract *Trahison des clercs*, a book which he cites as a "masterpiece" written by a "wise and cranky French Jew."[16] Intellectuals are "rebels without causes,"[17] who "must oppose society . . . and arguing is their world. It is what they do."[18] Gelernter then cites Mary McCarthy's description of Philip Rahv, editor of the *Partisan Review.* "Dispute was his art form," said McCarthy. Intellectuals are "always a minority":[19]

> Disaffection or "alienation" comes with the job. Of course they are rebels. Any society that does not give its intellectuals money, does not give them prestige but does give them cultural influence is grossly foolish; is asking for trouble. And almost deserves what it gets.[20]

One of Gelernter's main complaints against the cultural revolution is that "young people learn left-liberal theories at school instead of facts."[21] Gelernter's book is a prime example of "theory" triumphing over "fact." The theory is neoconservatism. The one fact which gets repeatedly ignored is the role which Jews played in the cultural revolution which destroyed everything Gelernter claims to hold sacred.

The same holds true for Gelernter's analysis of the role which *Partisan Review* played in the cultural revolution of the 1960s: "Between *Partisan Review* in 1939 and Norman Mailer in 1968," Gelernter tells us, "the intelligentsia had taken over the establishment."[22] Does it matter that both Norman Mailer and Philip Rahv, "one of the creators and editors of *Partisan Review,*" were both Jewish? Gelernter doesn't think so.

Eventually, Gelernter is forced by the weight of his own evidence to concede that, yes, the Jews did, in fact, play a role in the cultural revolution that, according to his own account, wrecked America:

> By 1970, the world had changed. Jews were a major presence among students and professors at the elite universities, and starting to make

> their presence felt in the administration too. As the Jewish presence at top colleges shot up and burst into bloom, three Jewish attributes stayed the same: politically, American Jews are far to the left of the mainstream. (Thus Milton Himmelfarb's famous observation that Jews earn like Episcopalians and vote like Puerto Ricans.) Culturally, Jews have always admired intellectuals. The Jewish way of argument is expert and aggressive. Naturally, we would expect that an increasing Jewish presence at the top colleges would have these consequences: The colleges would move left politically; They would come closer to the intellectuals' worldview—becoming increasingly intellectualized.They would acquire a more thrusting, belligerent tone.[23]

Gelernter admits in cryptic terms that the cultural revolution was Jewish when he writes:

> If the one thing we knew about postwar American society were the changing relationship of Jews to elite universities, we would expect a change in American culture: a leftward breeze. A slightly more intellectualized tone. And at the colleges, a less restrained presentation of views. It was a hard gale. The distinctively Jewish worldview was important to this process.[24]

But once he makes this admission, the excuses begin, as when he writes: "Jews didn't cause these big changes: they are too scarce on the ground."[25] The real problem was not the Jewish Revolutionary Spirit; it was—you probably guessed by now—anti-Semitism:

> Bigotry at WASP colleges reflected WASP bigotry in general—not the sort that was guilty of pogroms and lynching, but the smooth and easy variety, Bigotry Lite, for fastidious anti-Semites; it merely posts signs reading "Keep Out." W. H. Auden wrote in 1946 that "The American Country Club . . . is both inexcusable and vulgar, for, since it purports to be democratic, its exclusion of Jews is a contradiction for which it has to invent dishonest rationalizations."[26]

Auden's remark brings to mind an anecdote that Barry Goldwater loved to tell. Since his father was Jewish, Goldwater claimed that he was only allowed to play nine holes at restricted golf courses. If the Jews were, in reality, as evidence from Gelernter's own book shows, the *avant garde* of the cultural revolution of the '60s, then it was not bigotry to exclude them from the institutions they longed to destroy. It was common sense. Even a liberal like Theodore Hesburgh told Ralph McInerny, "If you let them [the Jews] in, they take over."

As Heinrich Graetz, the father of Jewish historiography, pointed out, study of the Talmud has led to the corruption of the Jewish mind, which in its rejection of Logos became a destructive force in human history:

> A love of twisting, distorting, ingenious quibbling, and a foregone antipathy to what did not lie within their field of vision, constituted the character of the Polish Jews. Pride in their knowledge of the Talmud and a spirit of dogmatism attached even to the best rabbis, and undermined their moral sense. The Polish Jews of course were extraordinarily pious, but even their piety rested on sophistry and boastfulness. . . . The vulgar acquired the quibbling method of the schools and employed it to outwit the less cunning. They found pleasure and a sort of triumphant delight in deception and cheating.[27]

Gelernter has most probably never read Heinrich Graetz, nor, if he had, would he be inclined to cite a passage this telling about the Jewish mind, but the general idea makes its way into Gelernter's book nevertheless because the "delight in deception and cheating" which characterizes the Jewish mind is too all-pervasive to ignore. Gelernter, as a result, claims:

> The classic Jewish argument drills and blasts as deep as necessary, or deeper (the essence of Jewish genius is not knowing where to stop); it summons ideas from the ends of the earth to make a point.[28]

Here Gelernter substantiates the thesis of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit.* The Jew doesn't know "where to stop" because his identity derives from the rebellion against Logos which began at the foot of the cross when the Jews rejected Christ, the Logos Incarnate, and had him put to death. Because the Jew rejects Logos, he becomes a destructive force, knowing no limits, and becomes a danger to any society or organization which admits him as a member.

IPSO FACTO A REVOLUTIONARY

The Jew is *ipso facto* a revolutionary. Hence, he played a leading role in the cultural revolution of the 1960s. The evidence that Gelernter presents leads inexorably to this conclusion. Yet, Gelernter refuses to draw the conclusion which his premises demands. All Gelernter can do is make a distinction without a difference, as when he writes:

> So let us be clear. Jewish intellectuals, *not as Jews but as intellectuals*, were an important part of the flood that washed away American culture as it used to be; and they ranked among the culture revolution's most sophisticated, intelligent, articulate, and belligerent voices [his emphasis].[29]

Got that? It was Jewish intellectuals, not intellectual Jews who destroyed America during the cultural revolution of the '60s. But can't a revolutionary be both a Jew and an intellectual? Gelernter seems to admit this when he refers to Jewish intellectuals. But in spite of being the oldest group of intellectuals in human history, Jews derive no content from their heritage, even though Gelernter has already admitted that Jews don't know when to stop when they

get into an argument. We are faced with a dilemma. Is Gelernter really this stupid? Or is he merely pretending to be a conservative culture warrior because he thinks the *goyim are* that stupid? Is a book like *America-Lite* something that the Jews laugh about when they talk among themselves? Is it another example of putting one over on the dumb *goy*, of the sort they used to laugh about when their ancestors swindled Polish farmers out of their money with a combination of vodka and usury in the Pale of the Settlement?

Now, instead of laughing at the Poles behind their backs, Gelernter can laugh at the expense of the WASP ruling class for hiring him and his *Landsmaenner* to teach at places like Yale. He can ridicule the WASP elite for treating him well or, more importantly, taking him seriously.

According to Gelernter's theory, the cultural revolution of the 1960s began when the Ivy League initiated the Great Reform of higher education by ending quotas restricting the number of Jewish students. Once the quotas were lifted Jews began to take over the university:

> Things would have been different if the old schoolmasterly elite had stayed on to run these institutions and oppose the intellectual profs in the name of tradition and courtesy, strict standards and intellectual freedom and love of country. But such a world would have been no more stable than a ball balanced on a pyramid. Once the intellectuals [i.e., the Jews] started to run admission and faculty hiring. . . the old ways couldn't have possibly remained.[30]

This was a good thing, of course because; "The top colleges were wrong to keep Jews out just because they were Jews, as the colleges were wrong in all their bigoted ways."[31] So the good old days weren't so good after all.

But wait, if the Jews were aggressive promoters of cultural revolution, then the WASP elite was not bigoted at all and perfectly justified in excluding Jews from their institutions. Because he can't talk honestly about the role which Jews played in the cultural revolution of the 1960s, Gelernter involves himself in a morass of self-contradiction, as when he writes: "And so, in the early 1920s, officials at top colleges reacted by reducing Jewish enrollments and thereby preventing the cultural transformation of their colleges."[32]

Wait a minute! Thwarting the cultural revolution is a good thing, isn't it? Gelernter can't bring himself to say so because defending the university, of necessity, would have involved excluding Jews, which he perceives as anti-Semitism, as when he writes: "Was this bigotry, was it prejudice? Of course. Robert Corwin, who designed Yale's anti-Jewish admission policy accused Jewish students of lacking 'manliness, uprightness, cleanliness, native refinement, etc.'"[33] If the Jews were determined to destroy WASP institutions, as they did during the cultural revolution, then the WASPs had every right to exclude them without being demonized as anti-Semites. Unfortunately, the WASPs weren't smart enough to figure this out.

Gelernter hates Affirmative Action. According to Gelernter the reason Jews got hired was simple: "pure merit."[34] Jews, of course, need no affirmative action because they are so intelligent, according to George Gilder, or so good at cheating on tests, according to Nicholas Lemann. Whatever. Gelernter uses his attack on affirmative action to kvell about fellow Jews:

> Watching the sustained expansion in the number of Jews as students, then faculty, then deans and presidents of the leading universities means watching intellectual excellence unseat social prominence as the grand organizing principle.[35]

"Jews," Gelernter continues, "were more than satisfied with intellectual merit as the main criterion."[36] What followed was the Jewish takeover of the Ivies, which he describes in frankly sexual terms reminiscent of *Portnoy's Complaint*: "Once the door was open to Jews, the seal was punctured; purity was lost."[37] For those who haven't read *Portnoy's Complaint* in a while, I'm referring to Portnoy's description of "another gentile heart broken by me [which] belonged to The Pilgrim, Sarah Abbot Maulsby."[38] Portnoy's affair with Sarah Maulsby corresponded in time to his work "on the staff of the House subcommittee investigating the television quiz scandals."

ONE HAPPY YIDDEL

Gentile America was nothing more than "commercial deceit on a national scale," something which made Portnoy

> one happy yiddel down there in Washington, a little Stern gang of my own, busily exploding Charlie's honor and integrity, while simultaneously becoming lover to that aristocratic Yankee beauty whose forebears arrived on these shores in the seventeenth century.[39]

By adverting to the Jewish take-over of the Ivies in sexual terms, Gelernter links himself to the same cultural revolutionaries he purports to criticize in his book. Like Philip Roth, Professor Gelernter showers his contempt on the WASP elite for treating him well. After the Jewish takeover of Harvard, Yale, and Princeton, "Elite WASPs everywhere breathed a sigh of relief and got back to fiddling with their spinnakers and canoes and other WASP things—snowshoes, moose heads, liquor cabinets, etc,"[40] Gelernter sneers. Portnoy could have married Sarah the WASP–"Why didn't I marry the girl? Well, there was her cutesy wootsy boarding school argot it sounded, I said, as though she had gone to Vassar with Donald Duck's nephews." But he got more satisfaction from violating her—"I assaulted and she surrendered"[41]—and, more importantly, violating everything she stood for:

> What I'm saying doctor, is that I don't seem to stick my dick up these girls, as much has I stick it up their backgrounds – as though through

> fucking I will discover America. Conquer America – maybe that's more like it.[42]

The introduction of the Standard Aptitude Test or College Board as a primary admission criterion at colleges across the nation is often used as an example of the Great Reform, but Gelernter claims that the SATs were introduced to exclude Jews in a manner more subtle than quotas:

> Beginning with Harvard in 1926, the Ivies had another weapon in their WASPness-protection arsenals: the Scholastic Aptitude Test. The SAT required a more refined knowledge of English than old-style admission tests. Jewish candidates in these years were often children of immigrants who had grown up in Jewish speaking households.[43]

Gelernter gets this completely wrong. Far from keeping Jews out, the SATs enabled the Jewish takeover of the Ivy League. At this point, it's time to deal with the myth of Jewish intelligence, as expounded by people like George Gilder. The reason Jews got admitted in large numbers to Ivy League schools is, as Nicholas Lemann pointed out in his book *The Big Test*, because they cheated on the SAT test, which became the main criterion for college admission in the post-World War II era. In the early 1950s Stanley H. Kaplan, a graduate of City College of New York, who in spite of his good grades couldn't get a job, set up a small tutoring operation in a modest building in the Flatbush section of Brooklyn. Kaplan capitalized on Jewish educational aspirations at a time when the SAT had firmly established itself as the official rite of passage for entry into the colleges that granted access to the top positions in the American meritocracy. The WASP ruling class under Henry Chauncey's direction had created what it thought was an un-coachable test that measured pure mental ability. The Jew Kaplan was smart enough to see through WASP pretensions and come up with a system that guaranteed better test results.

The system was so simple that it hardly qualifies as a system at all. In the days when the blueprint for building the atomic bomb was an open secret compared to the questions on the SAT test, Kaplan came up with a simple but ingenious way to subvert the system. After each class graduated from Kaplan's school and took the test, he would invite them back to celebrate with hot dogs and root beer; admission to the party was gained by having each student tell Kaplan one question he remembered from taking the test. The net result of Kaplan's parties was the list of the questions that his students would face when taking the SATs. If Kaplan tutored five classes of fifty students in one year, at the end of that year he had 250 questions. By the time Kaplan sold his test-prep business to the *Washington Post* company in the '70s, for $50 million he had over 30 years experience in gathering questions, which meant he could tell his students with increasing accuracy the answers to those questions as well. Jewish scores on the SATs rose accordingly, as did Jewish admission to the prestigious colleges that had established quotas to keep them out in

the early 20th century. It is unlikely that people like Conant and Chauncey and Brigham considered Jews from Brooklyn the candidates most likely to fulfill Jefferson's ideal of the natural aristocrat, but the Jews were the main beneficiaries of the system that Chauncey and Conant put in place to rescue nature's aristocrats from the rubbish that the SAT was raking through in the period following World War II. The WASP faith in "science," based as it was on the idea of noblesse oblige they had learned at prep schools like Groton, proved no match for clever Jews from Brooklyn, who quickly filled the slots the WASPs had reserved for nature's aristocrats in the meritocracy. Harvard University can now boast of a faculty and student body that is between 30 and 40 percent Jewish. The type of people that Carl Brigham thought his test would exclude, because they weren't particularly intelligent, ended up using his test to take over America's elite universities, not because they were intelligent but because they were, as Heinrich Graetz, had pointed out, good at "deception and cheating."

Once that happened it was only a matter of time before they took over American culture, something that occurred in the mid-'70s, just as opposition to the SATs was reaching a fever pitch. Perhaps the most visible Jew at Harvard is Alan Dershowitz, who grew up in Borough Park, Brooklyn, and is the world's foremost apologist for Zionism, torture, and targeted assassination. Dershowitz was involved in a knock-down-drag-out fight with Norman Finkelstein, another Jew from Borough Park, when he waged a nation-wide publicity campaign to deny Finkelstein tenure at DePaul University in Chicago.

Kaplan founded a prep course for the college boards which eventually taught the Jews who took his course the answer to every question they would be asked, and the *goyim* from Princeton who wrote the test were too dumb to figure out what was going on until it was too late. This is not an aberration based on the behavior of a few bad apples. Jews, as Heinrich Graetz pointed out, are taught to cheat by their study of the Talmud. Cheating is part of the cultural patrimony of the Jewish race.

Gelernter criticizes T. S. Eliot when he claims, "It is the final consummation of an American to become, not an Englishman but European—something no born Englishman, no person of European nationality can become." Like the dog that Heraclitus described, who barks at what he cannot understand, Gelernter attacks Eliot for allegedly ignoring:

> that European Jews had achieved this distinction long before he ever thought of it. Rarely accepted as *bona fide* nationals of any European state, Jews were nonetheless co-creators of European thought, along with the ancient Greeks, and they spoke with authority on European arts and letters, history and science. But Americans long ago pulled loose from Europe and invented a new nation, struggled to build it, and became

> the most productive (economically, intellectually) and freest nation in history.

Gelernter manifests two problems here: first, he doesn't understand what America is. America is a country which went from barbarism to decadence without finding civilization along the way, as George Bernard Shaw famously put it. Secondly, and more importantly, he doesn't know what a Jew is either. The same ideology of American Zionism which prevents him from understanding any real America prevents him from coming to any real understanding of the Jews. To begin with, America is not a nation. Secondly, it is not "the most productive (economically, intellectually) and freest nation in history" if the measure of prosperity is the wealth of the nation and not the riches of the (often Jewish) usurers who control the economy. Jews made up less than two percent of the American population but they accounted for 48 percent of the country's billionaires when Gelernter wrote his book. People like Gelernter take this as proof that Jews are intelligent rather than seeing it as proof that the Jews, who never gave up their ancestral involvement in usury, wrecked the economy with their reckless disregard of the moral law in 2008.

Gelernter's American Zionism, as I said, prevents him from any clear understanding of the Jews. The Jews are not the descendents of the Hebrews of the Old Testament *in any sense of the term*, which is to say not genetically and, more importantly, not spiritually or intellectually. Shlomo Sand settled the first issue definitively in his book *The Invention of the Jewish People*, and Jesus Christ settled the latter issue once and for all in chapter seven of the Gospel of St. John.

Gelernter tells us that "Jews are the senior nation of the Western world: they have a continuous cultural history of perhaps three thousand years."[44] This is patently false. There is no continuity, either religious or racial, linking present day Jews to Moses or Abraham. The Ashkenazi come from the Black Sea. They are, according to *National Geographic's* interpretation of the Genome Project, a Turkic race. Similarly, the Talmud, the heart of the Jewish people according to the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, was confected after the fall of the Temple, which is to say, after the founding of Christianity and in reaction to Christianity, which is to say, having no continuity with the religion of the Torah, which, as Jesus pointed out, finds its fulfillment in Christianity.

The Jewish people as it exists today is a creation of the Talmud, which is the antithesis of both the Torah and the Christian Scriptures the Talmud was created to subvert. The Hebrew scriptures along with Greek philosophy certainly contributed to the creation of European thought, but the Talmud just as certainly did not. No Jew schooled in Talmudic thought ever "spoke with authority on European arts and letters, history and science."[45] The first Jew who presumed to speak about anything European was Moses Mendelssohn, and he could do so only by repudiating the Talmud and everything it stood

for, something that Solomon Maimon echoed in his memoirs about the baleful influence that the Shul had on his life in "darkest Lithuania." When Talmudic Jews like Sigmund Freud started talking about European culture in the wake of Napoleon's emancipation of the Jews, it was only to subvert and destroy that culture.

In addition to being a Jewish attempt to co-opt the vocabulary of conservatism and the culture wars, this book, written in the election year of 2012, is also an attack on Barack Obama, who embodies everything that Gelernter hates. Gelernter hates affirmative action and characterizes it as "the greatest prejudice creator ever devised."[46] Obama, in Gelernter's view, is clearly a beneficiary of affirmative action, which is reason enough to attack him, but when Gelernter calls Barack Obama "a PORGI Airhead," he's really complaining about Obama's failure to continue the disastrous neoconservative policies carried out by George Bush in the Middle East, in particular his failure to attack Iran and his ongoing feud with the Likudniks and neoconservatives over foreign policy issues concerning Israel.

How, Gelernter wonders, "could the president of the United States be ignorant of commonplace truths that every reader of unbiased news has known for years?" Obvious truths like the fact that Israel can't be held to its 1967 borders? The answer is "Simple: the man is a PORGI Airhead, the acclaimed leader of an Airhead generation."[47]

Tom Paine once said that "In America the Law is King," but in his research Professor Gelernter never seems to have discovered that quote or the rule of law which wiser commentators have seen as the backbone of American culture. Instead Gelernter argues that Israel's enemies, specifically Khalid Sheikh Mohammed, be denied a trial and be subjected instead to "a brisk, orderly military hearing on some godforsaken Caribbean island" because "a public trial in downtown Manhattan would be as good as the slaughter of ten thousand innocents."[48] So much for America's belief in the rule of law.

Gelernter also recommends torture, as American. But wait, maybe that's unfair to Professor Gelernter, who claims that "Guantanamo was a well-run, humane, secure prison camp that made a special effort to accommodate Muslim inmates."[49] Obama ran afoul of Gelernter's American Zionism when he suggested closing down the torture facility at Guantanamo Bay in Cuba. This act gave encouragement to folks like the Detroit underwear bomber, the drugged up zombie who got through Israeli-run airport security without a passport and whom Gelernter refers to as "a terrorist and aspiring mass murderer."[50]

In the end Gelernter's attack on affirmative action (no matter how wrong affirmative action really is) turns out to be nothing more than the imposition of one more Jewish double standard. Gelernter attacks the "part of the new left's agenda" which calls for "reparations to blacks for slavery," but Germany's reparations payments to the state of Israel go unmentioned and are presumably

okay. Similarly, Obama is excoriated for what amounts to standing up to the Israel Lobby, while a Jewish thug like Larry Summers, who is head of Obama's council of economic advisors and was in the running for head of the Federal Reserve, is portrayed as yet one more victim of political correctness. Summers, according to Gelernter, had to resign from his position as president at Harvard because he "wondered whether the far larger number of male scientists might not reflect some built-in property of most men versus most women."[51] Summers had to resign because he presided over Harvard's looting of Russia, which in the 1990s was known as "privatization," causing Harvard to pay the largest fine in that university's long history.

Once again Gelernter gives us what St. Paul would have called "Jewish fables," while purporting to be grounded in the facts. Obama, according to Professor Gelernter "is the perfect model for a modern Harvard president . . . He would never have been visited by wrong thoughts of the sort that undid poor Larry Summers."[52] Gelernter forgot to tell us that "poor Larry Summers" regularly receives six-figure honoraria for speeches to Goldman Sachs and J. P. Morgan Chase, even after he brought about the crash of 2008 by playing a crucial role in the repeal of Glass-Steagall. Being Jewish, as the Jews at Harvard should know, means never having to say you're sorry.

Gelernter ends his book with a prayer: "God bless this brave, proud, strong, wise, reckless, and sublime nation, and its simple creed of liberty, equality, and its trust in American Zionism, America the shining city on a hill."

We end with a question: When are the Jews going to take responsibility for their destructive behavior and stop writing books which blame everything bad in our culture on fictional bogeymen like PORGIs or, the ultimate straw man, anti-Semites?

Chapter Thirteen

Woody Allen And the Double Standard

A priest friend of mine was suspended for child abuse. I wasn't planning to write about it, but the God who is the Lord of History put Woody Allen on the front page for the same crime, and suddenly it felt as if I were committing a sin of omission if I didn't write about it. The "it" in question is the double standard.

The accusations leveled against priests are always vague. Diocese spokesman Sean McBride said the abuse occurred within the Fort Wayne-South Bend diocese, but that, "out of respect for the alleged victim's identity and specific request, we are reticent to put forth the exact location of the allegation."[1] McBride failed to tell us that the alleged victim is dead, and that the abuse claim was filed by the deceased man's mother. In effect, the church convicts the priest in the court of public opinion by claiming that there is "sufficient evidence that the abuse did occur." Given the paucity of information, there is, in other words, no way to evaluate the claims. I called the priest and asked him if the accusations were true. He admitted to touching the boy, but denied any sexual behavior, which should have exonerated him since diocesan guidelines specify a "delict against the sixth commandment," i.e., sexual behavior.

Unlike the accusations against my priest friend, Dylan Farrow's claims were specific:

> when I was seven years old, Woody Allen took me by the hand and led me into a dim, closet-like attic on the second floor of our house. He told me to lay on my stomach and play with my brother's electric train set. Then he sexually assaulted me. He talked to me while he did it, whispering that I was a good girl, that this was our secret, promising that we'd go to Paris and I'd be a star in his movies. I remember staring at that toy train, focusing on it as it traveled in its circle around the attic. To this day, I find it difficult to look at toy trains.[2]

The same media which automatically assumes that every Catholic priest accused of abuse is guilty as charged lets Hollywood celebrities off the hook by insisting that they are innocent until proven guilty. The legal system prevented both Fr. Seculoff and Woody Allen from having their day in court.

In Connecticut, the legal system was intimidated by Woody Allen's wealth and fame. In Indiana, the Church derailed legal investigation by applying its own procedures. As a result, we'll never know the truth of the allegations. In both states, the statute of limitations has run out. In the case of Woody Allen, this is taken as proof of his innocence. In Indiana it is taken as proof of a Catholic priest's guilt. After being accused, Woody Allen had a full page of the *New York Times* put at this disposal to defend himself. Father Seculoff, on the other hand, was forbidden to speak to fellow priests.

"It's important to note that Woody Allen was never prosecuted in this case and has consistently denied wrongdoing; he deserves the presumption of innocence."[3] Said the *New York Times* reporter who published Dylan Farrow's letter. Sony Pictures Classics, which released "Blue Jasmine," said something similar: "We have had a long, productive and rewarding relationship with Mr. Allen," "Mr. Allen has never been charged in relationship to any of this, and therefore deserves our presumption of innocence."

If Sony Pictures, the distributor for Allen's films, were a Catholic diocese, Dylan Farrow could sue it for damages. In the real world of American law, Hollywood gets an exemption because it is rich and powerful and epitomizes Jewish America. But the Church is driven into bankruptcy by lawyers like Chicago attorney Marc Pearlman, "who has represented about 200 victims of clergy abuse in the Chicago area."[4]

No matter how it frames the issue, the Church shares the culture's view that every Catholic priest who is accused of sex abuse is guilty until proven innocent. The Church has found the priest guilty by claiming that the accusations are credible. The trial, if it ever comes to that, is a mere formality. The Catholic priest gets suspended pending an investigation, which invariably takes years. The priest's reputation is destroyed. Nothing can restore it. The diocese in effect pronounces the priest guilty before the investigation begins. The Church, in fact, solicits abuse claims:[5]

> If anyone has been the victim of sexual abuse by a member of the clergy, please contact the diocesan Victim Assistance Coordinator, Mary Glowaski at (260) 399-1458 or the Vicar General, Monsignor Robert Schulte at (260) 422-4611.[6]

Given solicitations like that and the fact that the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend had a "Report Sex Abuse Button" on its homepage, it is not surprising that three more people came forward to level charges. The next set of charges was vaguer than the first, but the diocese considered them "credible," and once that judgment had been made, the case was closed. There will be no trial. The Church is following its own rules here, as "delineated in the Charter for the Protection of Children and Young People (USCCB 2002, 2005, 2011)." In compliance with those rules, Bishop Rhoades "directed that these allegations

be forwarded to the Indiana civil authorities and the Vatican Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith."

Instead of asking why the Church has internalized the commands of its oppressors and imposed upon itself rules that apply to no other institution in this country, the local bishop concluded his statement with the usual pious boilerplate: "Bishop Rhoades asks everyone to please pray for all parties involved, especially for those that have come forward, as well as Fr. Seculoff, our priests, parishioners and all the faithful during these painful and difficult days."

There will never be a trial because the Church has already convicted one of its own in the court of public opinion. There will never be a trial in the Woody Allen case either, but for different reasons. As Dylan Farrow pointed out:

> I would be made to recount my story over and over again, to doctor after doctor, pushed to see if I'd admit I was lying as part of a legal battle I couldn't possibly understand. At one point, my mother sat me down and told me that I wouldn't be in trouble if I was lying – that I could take it all back. I couldn't. It was all true. But sexual abuse claims against the powerful stall more easily. There were experts willing to attack my credibility. . . . After a custody hearing denied my father visitation rights, my mother declined to pursue criminal charges, despite findings of probable cause by the State of Connecticut – due to, in the words of the prosecutor, the fragility of the "child victim." Woody Allen was never convicted of any crime. That he got away with what he did to me haunted me as I grew up. I was stricken with guilt that I had allowed him to be near other little girls. I was terrified of being touched by men. I developed an eating disorder. I began cutting myself. That torment was made worse by Hollywood. All but a precious few (my heroes) turned a blind eye. Most found it easier to accept the ambiguity, to say, "who can say what happened," to pretend that nothing was wrong. Actors praised him at awards shows. Networks put him on TV. Critics put him in magazines.[7]

What follows the Church's capitulation to the culture is negotiations among lawyers leading to the Church's bankruptcy. In late January 2014, the Diocese of Helena, Montana announced that it "plans to file for bankruptcy protection Friday from two lawsuits alleging the church covered up sexual abuse by clergy members."[8] The Diocese of Helena had to file for bankruptcy protection because "Several insurers have filed lawsuits challenging those claims, saying they should not have to pay damages for abuse that occurred before their policies went into effect."

The same thing may well happen in Chicago.[9] As we have pointed out elsewhere, the trouble started in the '60s with the sexualization of the culture in general and the culture of the Catholic clergy in particular. Carl Rogers set out to liberate the Immaculate Heart order in Los Angeles, and the result was

lesbian nuns. The same sort of thing happened at Notre Dame summer schools for the clergy during the '60s, as we have documented. Most people have normal appetites; since the Church was never going to allow married priests, the clergy who wanted normal lives left, which increased the percentage of homosexuals among the Catholic clergy. The next fatal step occurred when the Church substituted counseling for traditional Church discipline. This was a major source of the problem in Chicago. When "a 13-year-old boy reported in 1979 that a priest raped him and later threatened him at gunpoint to keep quiet," the Archdiocese of Chicago did not investigate the matter and punish the perpetrator. Instead, it "assured the boy's parents that . . . the cleric would receive treatment and have no further contact with minors."

SUCCESSFUL INSTITUTIONS

Robert Kaplan wrote, "Successful institutions treat everyone equally and impersonally."[10] This means that the American legal system is not a successful institution. It is characterized by a double standard. When it comes to sexual abuse, the rich Jew is innocent until proven guilty, but the Catholic priest is guilty until proven innocent. The same legal system that is used to exonerate Woody Allen is used to destroy Catholic priests. The double standard is impossible to ignore. In Philadelphia, ADL board member and DA, Lynn Abrams announced that she was going to investigate clergy sexual abuse, but only the Catholic Church got investigated.

Rabbis are notorious for suppressing sex abuse claims and demanding that they be adjudicated internally, something that Rabbi Eliyahu Fink brought up when he decried "the stereotypical lackadaisical approach to sex abuse in the Orthodox Jewish community."[11] According to Rabbi Fink's reading of the American double standard on sex abuse, "larger-than-life figures in the secular world" are "given a free pass on abuse. Their accusers are also silenced."[12]

As Cardinal Rodriguez pointed out, the sex abuse scandal is a club that has been used to beat the Church into submission. As if to prove him right, the United Nations' Human Rights Committee on the Rights of the Child attacked the Church's handling of sex abuse cases around the time that Dylan Farrow accused Woody Allen of child abuse. What claimed to be concern for children soon revealed itself as an attempt to change Church teaching. According to a Yahoo news article, the committee:

> urged the Vatican to amend its canon law to identify circumstances where access to abortion can be permitted for children, such as to save the life of a young mother. It urged the Holy See to ensure that sex education, including accesss to information about contraception and preventing HIV, is mandatory in Catholic Schools. It called for the Holy See to use its moral authority to condemn discriminaiton against homosexual children or children raised by same sex couples.

When the Polish bishops' conference attacked gender theory, claiming that it undermines the traditional family and sexual morality, they were accused of trying to "to shift attention away from a paedophile priest scandal."[13] The defenders of the sexualization of Polish culture claim that gender theory is "science." The Church claims that it poses "a mortal danger to families, child sexual orientation, and humanity." When an impasse of this sort arises, accusation of sexual abuse can be used to bring the Church in line.

After the Polish bishops released their pastoral letter, pundits like Adam Szostkiewicz, a "leading Polish religious affairs commentator," brought up the sex abuse scandal: "Someone advised the Church to find a topic that would make people forget about the paedophile scandals that Polish media was fixated on these last few months."[14] Szostkiewicz claimed that "the Church has turned 'gender' into a grab bag and tossed everything into it: civil unions, gay marriage, abortion, in-vitro fertilisation, gender equality and sexual education," when it should be obvious that gender theory promoting things like sex education, gay marriage, pornography, etc. is one of the main ways that the modern regime imposes its will on the population it ostensibly represents. Sexual liberation, as I have said in Poland and elsewhere, is a form of political control.

But that form of control is unraveling. To keep the proles under control in France, the regime increased the gravity of the charges they are willing to level against them. After a long line of anti-gay marriage protests, Interior minister Manuel Valls warned that "somber forces" were at work in France. The anti-gay marriage demonstrations were converging with the anti-Jewish demonstrations. M. Valls was upset: "We are witnessing a union of extremes, never before seen in France. . . [Last week] was the first time for a long time that people have screamed their hatred of Jews in the street. A block of protest is forming, a rebellion which is anti-elite, anti-state, anti-tax, anti-parliament, anti-press . . . but also, and above all, anti-Semitic, racist and homophobe."[15] Who brought this about? The very Hollande government that is wringing its hands because it happened. Is it really surprising that the French protesters would link the Jews and gay marriage? Didn't Joe Biden say the same thing? Evidently M. Valls is afraid that the word has reached France. Unfortunately for the regime, M. Valls's attempt at smear tactics wasn't having the desired effect:

> One protester, Alain, 67, a businessman, said: "Valls thinks that he can contain these protests by painting us all as dangerous extremists. When I was young, every left-winger was accused of being a communist. Now, to this government and the mainstream media, every right-winger is a fascist."

The Jewish support for gay marriage created its political opposite: radical Catholics who hold the Jews responsible for the moral corruption they have

spread through France. *The Independent* thinks that Alain Soral is behind this convergence, but as Soral has pointed out, the government itself is responsible. When asked why the government called him an anti-Semite, he responded that the Hollande government was controlled by Jews. The proof lay in the accusation. Duh.

The Independent does its best to reduce gender theory to a "modest programme" which "consists of trying to persuade girls that they can perfectly well drive tractors and boys that they can be ballet dancers if they want to." But the French aren't buying it. A 42-year-old mother of three sees gender theory as an attempt "to destroy the family. It is all part of the same plan as the gay marriage law, to impose a completely new set of values on French society." *The Independent* condemns as an "obscene rumour" the claim that "there would be masturbation and cross dressing in primary schools," but is the rumor so far-fetched?

Anyone who has read Wilhelm Reich, the father of sex education, knows that its primary goal is to promote masturbation among children, girls specifically. The convergence between "anti-Semitism" and opposition to gay marriage may be "somber" news to the regime, but it's hardly surprising. It's an indication that the French know how to put two and two together. The French get it. The Polish bishops get it. The one group that doesn't get it is the Catholic Americanists who have internalized the commands of their Jewish oppressors. The bishops who have lived by the Americanist sword are going to die by it. The sexual Americanism of people like Bryan Hehir and Joseph Cardinal Bernardin will find its final expression in bankruptcy court, as the legal system destroys the Church in America one diocese at a time.

One of our *Culture Wars* correspondents sent us a list of anti-Semitic websites.[16] "I wasn't even mentioned," I wrote to one of my Jewish friends. "What have I done wrong?" His response is instructive: "The problem [?] is that you are not anti-Semitic. Also, you represent traditional Roman Catholicism and that is their greatest fear. So that they cannot bring attention to you."

GREATEST FEAR

The thing the Jews fear most is not racism or anti-Semitism, which is a form of racism, but a Catholic repudiation of the failed experiments of Vatican II and a return to the traditional teaching of the Church, as expressed by St. Paul (I Thess 2) when he referred to Jews as "enemies of the entire human race." But as St. Augustine indicated, even those who hate the Logos, become, through the cunning of reason, pawns of the Logos they hate. The Jews, in other words, are bringing about the very thing they fear the most. Catholics in Poland and France are not becoming anti-Semites; they are waking up to the fact that the Jews control their countries and are using "gender ideology," i.e., gay marriage, sex education, pornography, performance "art," etc., as the

main form of social control. Sexual liberation is political control, and the plan on how to control a culture through sexual license was written by Jews, Jews like Wilhelm Reich. Is it surprising that people are waking up to this fact?

As the report of the United Nation's Human Rights Committee on the Rights of the Child made clear, the campaign against sexual abuse is really a campaign to change the teaching of the Church. It is an attempt to bring the Church in line with the secular orthodoxy regnant at places like the UN, the EU, and the United States Department of Health and Human Services. It is ultimately an attempt to destroy the Church. Unlike the Polish bishops, who understand how to contend with a hostile regime, the American bishops seem determined to embrace the Americanism that is determined to destroy them.

Chapter Fourteen

Null Bock

As the November 2014 mid-term election season limped toward the finish line, it threatened to become one of the least consequential elections in the history of the state of Indiana. In fact, if the May primary election was any indication of how people were going to vote in November, the elections of 2014 were on course to set a record for low voter turnout. "Turnout was pretty bad yesterday," said St. Joseph County Clerk Terri Rethlake one day after the May 2014 primary election, "only 6.48 percent."[2] Yes, the decimal point was in the proper place. The turnout was not 64.8 percent, which would have been low enough to invalidate an election in, say, Bosnia. It was 6.48 percent, which means according to United Nations' standards (or anyone else's) that this election was invalid because too few Hoosiers voted.

Not to be deterred by this obvious fact, the local politicians tried to see the silver lining in a very dark cloud. "I think it's a fluke," said Jake Teshka, Executive Director of the St. Joseph County Republican Party. "I don't think it's really a cause for concern." Then, contradicting what he had just said, Teshka continued, "the ballot he received when he went to the polls didn't have a single competitive race on it."[3]

So maybe the low turnout wasn't a fluke after all. Maybe the voters of St. Joseph County were trying to tell the politicians something that the politicians didn't want to hear. Those suspicions deepened in the wake of the one and only debate between the two candidates in the one and only competitive race in the county, the race for the Congressional seat for the second district, which pitted Republican incumbent Jackie Walorski against Democratic challenger, Joe Bock. Walorski was at the end of her first term in office, after spending a career in the county as a fundraiser for Ancilla College and head of the local Chamber of Commerce. Bock was a professor of public health at the University of Notre Dame, who had served as a state legislator in Missouri some 20 years ago.

The debate was a carefully orchestrated ballet in which both incumbent and challenger danced around the issues. To begin with, the debate was

held in Wabash, Indiana, a small town in the remotest corner of the Second Congressional District to insure low attendance. The mainstream media, who were actively collaborating with the candidates to keep the voters in the dark about the real issues in the election, hinted at this fact when Erin Blasko wrote that "the 40-minute contest at the Dallas Winchester Senior Center [was] in Wabash, about 60 miles southwest of Fort Wayne, on the southern end of the district which includes all of St. Joseph County."[4] If we were looking for an analogy between St. Joseph County and the World, a location 60 miles southwest of Fort Wayne meant that the debate was being held somewhere near Kamchatka.

The South Bend Tribune, it should be noted, regularly harangues the voters of the Second Congressional District about their civic duty to vote. The fact that 6.48 percent of the population acted on this advice is some indication of the influence this newspaper has on voter behavior.

The debate was a hollow charade, worthy of the worst excesses of the Breshnev era. In the Soviet Union, the workers pretended to work and the government pretended to pay them. In the United States, candidates for public office pretend that Republicans are different from Democrats. Walorski, who was still running TV ads of Jackie helping her mother fill out her social security forms as atonement for promising her Tea Party constituents during her campaign two years ago that she would privatize social security if elected, "focused on her efforts to reach across the aisle on issues such as military sexual assault, domestic violence and health care for veterans."[5] Joe Bock, for his part, "attacked Walorski for her vote on the government shutdown and for the Paul Ryan budget."[6] Both candidates simply read the list of talking points that their campaigns had issued months ago; neither candidate responded directly to the other candidate's claims. And that was that. Afterward, eleven carefully scripted questions got asked—five from "an independent panel" and six from the audience. When one member of the audience asked the candidates for the top three issues facing the voters of the Second Congressional district, he got the following response: "Bock's list included jobs, health care, and the threat of terrorism. Walorski's included jobs, a balanced budget, and national security."[7]

The unanimity that came out of the debate shows, of course, that great minds run in the same circles. It also shows that elections have become a game in which the ball of political power gets dribbled down the court and passed from Republican to Democrat and back to Republican in a meaningless exercise that keeps the duopoly in power, all duly reported in *The South Bend Tribune* and by the local TV stations, who profit from the political ads which the dribbling duopoly duly churns out as the local media's main source of revenue—next to the latest big Pharma forms of anesthetization. But the waning influence of the local newspaper, which finds expression in its ever-decreasing physical size, says nothing about their intention, which

is to keep the voters ignorant of what is going on while ensuring that they are active—nay, enthusiastic—participants in a system of governance that in no way represents their real interests. Chief Commissar in this regard is Jack Colwell, the aging pundit who reports on elections for *The South Bend Tribune*. Colwell, whose reporting can be relied on to take the side of the Democrats, the dominant party in South Bend, favors the hard-hitting question and answer format in his columns, as when he writes:

Q. So, does Bock's impressive win make him the favorite to defeat Congresswoman Walorski in the fall?

A. No. Far from it. Walorski, who had some high negative ratings in past campaign polls, has strengthened her image through work on legislation for veterans and to curtail sexual assaults in the military. She has a substantial lead in fundraising over Bock—over a half million dollars more in cash on hand on April 1. And the district was drawn to be "safe" Republican.

Q. What will be the key issues in the race this fall?

A. Bock will cite that vote by Walorski on the government shutdown and her vote for budget proposals of Republican Congressman Paul Ryan, contending that Ryan would destroy Medicare as it now operates and hurt students and the middle class. Walorski will continue to stress her opposition to Obamacare and contend that Bock would support the Affordable Care Act and other priorities and spending proposals of the Obama administration.

Q. So does Bock have a chance?

A. Of course. After all, Mullen, after the 2012 primary, went on to be an effective candidate and to darn near beat Walorski in that same Republican-drawn district. He was helped when Richard Mourdock, the tea party favorite for the Senate, spilled tea all over himself and hurt the entire Republican ticket. Outside factors could again affect the race, either way, helping Walorski to win big or giving Bock a better chance to pull an upset.

Q So, this election is important?

A Yes, even in Indiana, especially in the 2nd District, and for local races. Also, results for those "lesser" state offices sometimes have significant consequences.[8]

The fact that only 6.48 percent of the electorate responded to these stimuli bespeaks the law of diminishing returns, if nothing else. If the "key issues" are what Jack Colwell says they are, why should anyone vote?

However, Jack Colwell is right. This election is important, but not for the reasons he mentioned. As I said, the main purpose of the local mainstream media is to keep the voters in the dark about the real issues. If the voters of Congressional District 2 came away from the Bock-Walorski debate thinking there was no difference between the two candidates, they were wrong. There was a significant difference, but no one, most certainly the candidates themselves, wanted to talk about it.

One day after the one and only debate for the Second Congressional District race, Joe Bock appeared on "Israel," a local cable access TV show hosted by Notre Dame grad and sometime RV deliverer Peter Helland. During the course of Peter's show, it became clear that the District 2 election was a crucial race for the Israel Lobby. After Eric Cantor, the *de facto* leader of the Israel Lobby in the House was unexpectedly defeated, Jackie Walorski was being rumored as his successor. Not only that, Joe Bock was "pro-terror"! The source for that claim was a posting by Beverly Sandler at the Rabbi Reflects Blogspot, which Helland read aloud during his show before soliciting Bock's comments.

The tone of Sandler's posting was nothing if not dire. It was like Jack Colwell columns but with real content instead. "Elections matter," Sandler began:

> Indiana Congressional district 2 pits very pro Israel incumbent against very anti Israel pro BDS candidate. Support Walorski endorsed by the Protect Our Heritage Pac/(Midwest's largest pro israel [*sic*] pac) against Joe Bock. Israel and the world can't afford another anti Israel pro terrorist Congressman. Donations to https://donate.standwithjackie.com/ or jackiewarloski.com. PASS this on to anyone who lives near South Bend. As Jewish voters and supporters of Israel, it is our duty and responsibility to know who we voting [*sic*] for. In this information age we cannot allow facts to be buried.[9]

To which we can only say, "Amen, Bev." Thank God for "Jewish voters and supporters of Israel"! If it weren't for them sending notes like this through the secret networks of the Israel Lobby, the *goyim* would never know what this election was really about. Bev would be the ideal replacement for Jack Colwell, if he ever retires, because in listening to Bev we're getting the news straight from the horse's mouth, so to speak. We're getting it directly from the Israel Lobby, which as Professors Walt and Mearsheimer have pointed out, control America's foreign policy and the Congress as well, which Pat Buchanan characterized as "Israeli occupied territory."

Bev in other words, gives us the best analysis of what this election is really about:

> The voters of Indiana's 2nd Congressional district (our neighboring South Bend Region) have a critical decision [to make] as we approach our 2014 election cycle. I know I do not want a congressional representative who believes culpability for global terrorism lies on the backs of Israel and the US. Such is the case as Professor Joe Bock from Notre Dame is challenging the current Representative Jackie Walorski. While Rep. Walorski has been among Israel's finest supporters in Congress, Joe Bock has a history of supporting pro-Palestinian anti-Israel institutions

> including Al-Quds University, Caritas Internationalis [*sic*], and the UN's Division for Palestinian Rights.

Joe Bock, it turns out, is not your ordinary, run-of-the-mill *goy*. No, not by a long shot. In fact, Bock:

> openly exclaims [*sic*] injustices towards Palestinians without ever acknowledging the systematic terrorism Palestinians have engaged in. Bock advocates "Preaching the Word," a Catholic social doctrine that applies biblical justice to the Palestinians. Bock was assigned Country Representative for Catholic Relief Services (CRS) Jerusalem-West Bank-Gaza program, and settled in East Jerusalem for 3 years, ending just before the 2nd Intifada. Bock's wife Susan Lyke, who is also outspokenly anti-Israel has written. "I learned that Christians shouldn't sit on the fence when (Israeli) injustice is at play."

There you have it! The smoking gun! "Bock advocates 'Preaching the Word,' a Catholic social doctrine that applies biblical justice to the Palestinians"! Who knew? Why didn't Jack Colwell bring this up in his column?

It gets worse:

> Joe Bock and his wife Susan Lyke are members and supporters of Friends of Sabeel North America (FOSNA), a Palestinian Christian organization based in Jerusalem. FOSNA serves as the "voice for Palestinian Christians" against Israel's policies and has been a driving force behind various Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaigns against Israel, including those initiated by mainline Protestant churches in the U.S. They employ a "Palestinian liberation theology" which is based on the premise that the Bible's explicit descriptions of the land of Israel as belonging to the Jewish people must be repudiated and redefined. Friends of Sabeel's agenda calls for the right of return for Palestinian refugees, an end to American policies that support and give aid to Israel, and active engagement in the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) campaign. Friends of Sabeel hosts large conferences on University campuses (including Notre Dame) featuring strong anti-Israel themes and speakers who accuse Israel of racism, oppression, and human rights violations. Their speakers have also depicted Israel as a systematically racist country comparing Israeli policies to Nazism. They outspokenly purport that the pro-Israel lobby is excessively powerful and that Israeli interests control the U.S. government's foreign policy. Friends of Sabeel has similarly targeted high schools [*sic*] audiences throughout the U.S. in recent years. They sponsored an unsuccessful campaign in Minnesota against Israel Bonds stating it hoped their political efforts would be "replicated across the country to get state governments to pull their money out of investing in Israel."[10]

Bev is especially concerned about Christians supporting fellow Christians, especially when some of those Christians are Palestinians: "This Palestinian-Christian connection to other Christian groups is highly toxic, and a United States congressman that shares these views would have the ability to write and sponsor legislation that is very detrimental to Israel. How can we let this happen?"[11]

To make sure that the "toxic" collaboration between Catholics and Palestinians does not happen, Sandler ends her posting with a ringing endorsement of Jackie Walorski. Unlike Joe Bock:

> U.S. Rep. Jackie Walorski has emerged as one of Israel's strongest supporters. As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, she has won bipartisan support for new measures increasing pressures on Iran. Upon returning from Israel last August Walorski stated "As Israel continues to experience constant terror threats from surrounding countries, the United States recognizes its special bond to Israel and is proud to be a strong ally. As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I believe it is critical that the United States continues to focus on Israel's security, particularly from the growing nuclear threat in Iran, to help stabilize the region and protect our own national security interests." Both parties have identified this seat as a key battleground in 2014. With the rise of anti-semitism and Iran on the verge of nuclear power, we Jews are living in turbulent times that call for unity and action. How we respond to the detractors will determine how pro-Israel we are, REALLY.[12]

It's worth pointing out that the only reason the voters of the Second Congressional District had a clue about the real meaning of the Bock-Walorski race was Peter Helland's cable access TV show "Israel." That TV show provided, as well, the only vehicle whereby Candidate Joe Bock could respond to claims circulated through the Israel Lobby's networks. Which is what he did on the day following the one and only official debate. Bock denounced the charge that he was "pro-terror" as libelous and went on to refute Sandler's claims point by point. His support of Al-Quds University turns out to be a scholarship he gave to the son of a Palestinian taxi-driver. As for the other accusations, Bev condemns herself out of her own mouth.

The big question remains, however: Why did it take a cable access TV show to expose the real issue driving this election? Given his background and his status as the hopelessly underfunded underdog in the election, why did Joe Bock have to have Peter Helland drag this information out of him, especially since Bock knew that these libelous claims against him were circulating in the underground chambers of the Indiana Israel Lobby? Other questions need to be answered as well. If Jackie Walorski was determined to do an "attack video," she certainly had material more relevant than a pay raise Bock voted for 22 years ago when in the Missouri state legislature. Taking the Bev route,

however, would have entailed serious side effects for Jackie, the main one being that she would have outed herself as an agent of the Israel Lobby. So it's easy enough to understand why Jackie would not want to go there.

But why is Joe Bock determined to collaborate in his own defeat by not raising the real issue driving this campaign? A Bock attack video would have been much simpler. He could have run footage of Jackie testifying before Congress that Israel does not target civilians[13] followed by footage of the 3,000 some "untargeted" civilians who died during the Israeli incursion the previous summer of 2014. Footage of the dead women and children who died after Israeli tanks shelled a UN school that was clearly marked as a shelter would have underscored his point. And then Joe Bock could have asked the $64,000 question: "Does Jackie Walorski represent the people of Indiana or the Israel Lobby?" But he didn't, and why he didn't will remain a point of conjecture.

As Joe Bock was leaving the WNIT studio in downtown South Bend after filming Peter's show, I mentioned Jackie's testimony before Congress and asked him if he thought that the Israelis intentionally targeted civilians. After some hemming and hawing, he said, "No, I don't think they intentionally targeted civilians." How he can maintain this position after living for three years in Israel is anyone's guess. Does he secretly share Bev's view that being "outspokenly anti-Israel" is tantamount to being "pro-terror?" He said he did not on Peter's show, but if that is the case, why didn't he say so in public before that?

The answer to that and other questions is our totally corrupt political system. The system is so corrupt that no one is allowed to talk about it, not even candidates who are being libeled by it and thereby doomed to defeat. Shorn of the religious input that the Catholic Church could have provided over the past 50 years, America was unable to prevent the complete eclipse of its own democratic principles and their replacement by the crudest form of Jewish plutocracy, symbolized best by the role which casino mogul Sheldon Adelson played in the 2012 presidential elections, or in the so-called "Sheldon Adelson Primary" which took place in the run-up to the 2016 presidential elections, or in the 20-some standing ovations that the entire American Congress gave to Binyamin Netanyahu in the Spring of 2011 in order to keep Jewish money flowing into their coffers. When asked what kind of government America's founding fathers had created, Benjamin Franklin replied, "A republic, if you can keep it." Well, by the time George W. Bush left the White House in 2008, America had entered into a state of totalitarian decadence that was the antithesis of everything that America's founding fathers had sought to maintain.

The verdict of history is now in. "The West," as Denethor claimed prophetically in J.R.R. Tolkien's novel *The Lord of the Rings*, "has failed." The experiment in ordered liberty which was launched by America's founding fathers at the end of the 18th century has degenerated into an Israeli-managed

police and surveillance state under the leadership of dual citizens like Michael Chertoff, whose body scanners now scrutinize our private parts in the hope of thwarting terrorist plots. Like its predecessors, the East German Stasi and the Bolshevik CHEKA, the Department of Homeland Security views the people as the enemy of the regime and relies on a network of Jewish spies, informants and commissars to keep them in line.

That Joe Bock is not a part of that regime and that Jackie Walorski is should be obvious. Unfortunately, what William Butler Yeats said in "The Second Coming" is truer now than when he wrote it almost 100 years ago: "The best lack all conviction, while the worst/Are full of passionate intensity."

Walorski defeated Bock by a wide margin: "Unofficially, Walorski collected 58.9 percent of the vote or 85,119 votes to 38.3 percent or 55,331 votes for Bock."[14] Walorski celebrated her victory by telling her supporters: "This is a great night for America"[15] when what she should have said is that it was a great night for AIPAC. Bev can sleep better now that the pro-terror candidate was defeated.

Joe Bock blamed his defeat on "serious headwinds . . . on the national scene . . . including ISIS, the Ebola scare, and an unpopular president,"[16] but in the final analysis the main reason he lost the election was lack of funding. Walorski raised more than $1 million more than Bock in campaign contributions and outspent him 2-1. "Money is so dominant now in our political system it's pathetic," Bock said. "I can say I wish I would have had a better message, or that I would have shook [*sic*] more hands, but the bottom line is I needed more money."

Bock's post-mortem on his defeat was every bit as conventional as the campaign he ran. Bock didn't deserve to win because he refused to take on the main issue driving this campaign, namely, the role of the Israel Lobby in Indiana's Second Congressional District. Bock had the background to make this an issue but he refused to do so. When Peter Helland brought up the issue on his cable access TV show late in the campaign, the Bock campaign tried—successfully, it turns out—to suppress the story. Because of their pressure, Helland's show didn't air until after the election, and Bock went down to defeat anyway. When asked if Israel targeted civilians in Gaza during Operation Protective Edge in the summer of 2014, Bock said no, thereby obliterating a key issue in the campaign, one which should have been raised from the beginning. As a result, the Israel Lobby got to control the election from behind the scenes, and the candidate who had the background to oppose them censored himself and lost the election.

Just as the polls were closing in Indiana on November 4, Amnesty International issued its report on the 50-day war in the Gaza, claiming that the IDF "showed 'callous indifference' to civilians in airstrikes on homes that felled entire families."[17] *The New York Times* and virtually every other article on the AI report cited the claim that "Palestinian armed groups fired thousands of indiscriminate rockets and mortar rounds into civilian areas of

Israel," suggesting a moral equivalance that was belied by the details of the report, which got suppressed by the mainstream media. During Operation Protective Edge, six Israeli civilians, including one four-year-old boy were killed by Hamas' indiscriminate rocket attacks. Israeli airstrikes, on the other hand, killed 2,200 Palestinians, including more than 500 children in the course of destroying more than 100,000 buildings. To say that these casualties did not come as a result of direct targeting of civilians strains the credulity of all but the most rabid supporter of Israel, which is why the mainstream media reported on it in their biased fashion. "The repeated, disproportionate attacks on homes indicate that Israel's current military tactics are deeply flawed and fundamentally at odds with international humanitarian law," said Philip Luther, director of Amnesty International's Middle East and North Africa program.[18]

Mainstream media accounts omitted passages from the report which gave any evidence of the criminal disproportionality of Israel's response:

> In the single deadliest attack documented in the report, 36 members of four families including 18 children were killed when the three-storey al-Dali building, was struck. Israel has not announced why the building was targeted, but Amnesty International has identified possible military targets within the building. The second deadliest attack appears to have targeted a member of the al-Qassam Brigades, Hamas' armed wing, who was outside the Abu Jame' family home. The house was completely levelled killing 25 civilians including 19 children. Regardless of the intended targets, both of these attacks constitute grossly disproportionate attacks and under international law, they should have been cancelled or postponed as soon as it was evident that so many civilians were present in the house. Israeli officials have failed to give any justification for carrying out these attacks. In some of the cases in this report Amnesty International has not been able to identify any possible military target. In those cases it appears that the attacks directly and deliberately targeted civilians or civilian objects, which would constitute war crimes.[19]

Joe Bock could not have cited this report during his campaign, but he was uniquely qualified to raise the issue of the Israel Lobby and its control of the second district as part of his campaign. He chose not to and, as a result, deserved to lose the election. Joe announced on Peter Helland's show that he was working with J Street, the liberal Jewish Lobby. Whether he refused to raise the issue or he was cowed into not raising the issue by his staff is immaterial now.

Joe Bock's moral failure should provide a cautionary tale to future challengers who want to unseat the Israel Lobby's incumbent. This issue is not going to go away. Jackie Walorski's video defending Israeli war crimes is accessible on YouTube, and it will most probably remain there as long as she

is the pawn of Jewish money. The only question is whether another challenger will have the courage to mention the Jewish elephant in the second district room. The evidence about Israel's intention is now in. The Israelis targeted civilians; the Israelis are guilty of war crimes. Jackie Walorski is on record as supporting their criminal activity. As Philip Luther put it: "It is tragic to think that these civilian deaths could have been prevented. The onus is on Israeli officials to explain why they chose to deliberately flatten entire homes full of civilians, when they had a clear legal obligation to minimize harm to civilians and the means of doing so."[20]

Chapter Fifteen

Why We Lost the Culture Wars

David Brooks was decent enough to tell us that the culture wars are over. We lost. The Jews won; that's the bad news. The good news is that there will be no Morgenthau plan for the losers in this war. The Jews are not going to starve us to death as Morgenthau intended to do to the Germans after World War II. No, we can all just go back to being the docile consumers and sexual robots we were before the wars started, and if we have a twinge of conscience every now and then, well, we culture warriors are good people, and so we can work off our frustrations by serving in a soup kitchen.

Unfortunately, there is some truth in what David Brooks said. The Catholic Church has lost every battle in the culture wars for more than 50 years. Beginning with the collapse of the Legion of Decency and the *Griswold v. Connecticut* decision decriminalizing the sale of contraceptives, the Church has suffered one defeat after another, culminating in the *Obergefell* decision striking down every law which specified that marriage had to be between a man and a woman.

It's not as if the Church hasn't tried. It has been intellectually crippled by a set of bad ideas that insures failure. The main bad idea at the heart of this problem is religious freedom. The architect of that bad idea was John Courtney Murray.

Everyone knew that John Courtney Murray had something to do with the redefinition of the Catholic position on religious freedom. Everyone knew that he wrote notes for the Abbott edition of *Dignitatis Humanae*, which fundamentally distorted the meaning of that document. What no one knew until the publication of David Wemhoff's book, *John Courtney Murray, TIME/LIFE, and the American Proposition: How the CIA's Doctrinal Warfare Program Changed the Catholic Church*, is the extent of Murray's collaboration with Henry Luce, *Time/Life*, and the CIA in crippling the Catholic Church by imposing on it a false understanding of religious liberty.

The Manhattan Declaration, which is discussed at more length in chapter seven of this volume, is a good case in point. Endorsed by "more than half a dozen of this country's most influential Roman Catholic bishops," it

promised resistance, even civil disobedience, to any law that might implicate their churches or charities in abortion, embryo-destructive research, or same-sex marriage. At a Washington press conference Justin Cardinal Rigali of Philadelphia made the case for the natural law opposition to gay marriage, asserting that marriage entailed a "conjugal union of man and woman, ordained by God from the creation, and historically understood by believers and non-believers alike, to be the most basic institution in society." Six years later, the Supreme Court approved gay marriage.

With hindsight, it's not difficult to understand how this happened. Immediately after denouncing gay marriage, Cardinal Rigali endorsed "religious liberty, which is grounded in the character of God, the example of Christ, and the inherent freedom and dignity of human beings created in the divine image" without comprehending that the concept of religious liberty exists precisely to marginalize his authority as a bishop of the Catholic Church, which speaks infallibly on matters of faith and morals. It may be true that the Manhattan Declaration rests on "principles that can be known and honored by men and women of good will even apart from revelation" and that "they are principles of right reason and natural law," but only the Church has the authority to interpret the divine law infallibly. By becoming one of thousands of signatories to an interdenominational manifesto, Rigali diluted that authority, played into the hands of the founding fathers, who promoted the proliferation of sects to divide and dilute Christianity, and doomed the initiative against gay marriage to failure.

The Catholic Church has been intellectually crippled by a number of bad ideas. John Courtney Murray's understanding of religious liberty is one. The notion that Jews are our friends or "elder brothers" is another bad idea, one which overlooks the fact that the Jews were behind the push for gay marriage, and that the overthrow of all laws defining marriage as between a man and a woman could not have succeeded without Jewish leadership.

On May 21, 2013, Vice President Joseph Biden "praised Jewish leaders in the media . . . crediting them with helping change American attitudes on gay marriage."[1] In a speech at a Democratic National Convention reception celebrating Jewish Heritage Month, Biden claimed that the Jews were responsible for changing peoples' attitudes on gay marriage: "It wasn't anything we legislatively did. It was 'Will and Grace,'" said Biden, referring to an NBC sitcom that went off the air years ago. "It was the social media. Literally. That's what changed peoples' attitudes. That's why I was so certain that the vast majority of people would embrace and rapidly embrace" gay marriage, "I bet you 85 percent of those changes, whether it's in Hollywood or social media, are a consequence of Jewish leaders in the industry. . . . The influence is immense, the influence is immense. And, I might add, it is all to the good."[2]

The liberal Jewish magazine *Tikkun* agreed with Vice President Biden's assessment: gay marriage was a Jewish creation.[3] As Amy Dean put it: "In a few short years, same-sex marriage went from being an untouchable political hot potato to a broadly accepted civil right in eighteen states and the District of Columbia. Jews, and their social justice organizations, helped make that happen."

Dean pointed to the Manhattan Declaration and the fact that, as of 2009, large religious organizations like the Mormons, the Catholics, and the Southern Baptists had drawn a line in the sand to show the forces arrayed against gay activists and their Jewish backers:

> Marriage, they declared, could only be between a man and a woman. Prominent members of those religious organizations signed the Manhattan Declaration, which claimed that gay marriage violated both unaided reason and divine revelation. Nineteen states went on to pass referenda which declared that marriage could only be contracted between a man and a woman.

Then the counterattack occurred. Federal courts overturned all of the marriage statutes, and the Supreme Court sealed victory for the homosexual marriage forces in its *Obergefell* decision in July 2015. The main cause of this stunning reversal was, as Vice President Biden had pointed out, Jewish control of the media, supplemented, as Amy Dean pointed out in *Tikkun*, by the efforts of Jewish political activists like Rabbi David Saperstein, who lent the homosexual cause the aura of religious respectability. According to Amy Dean, none of this would have happened without Jewish support:

> The victories in the states around marriage equality owed much to local and national Jewish social justice groups who looked beyond the political consensus of the time. Even five years ago, many of these groups stood behind same-sex couples who wished to marry. National Jewish social justice organizations such as the National Council of Jewish Women, the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism, and Bend the Arc (on whose board I currently serve as co-chair) helped to galvanize the American Jewish community to support pro-marriage equality bills in the states. In fact, Jews can claim a fair share of the credit for bringing Americans to a tipping point of accepting marriage equality.

This was particularly true in California, where the Jews were instrumental in overthrowing the will of the majority, that had enacted Proposition 8 defining marriage as only possible between a man and a woman:

> In California, the Progressive Jewish Alliance (PJA), which is now part of Bend the Arc, joined a local coalition of progressive Jewish faith groups. Called Kol Tzedek, the coalition came together in 2008 to support San Francisco's then-mayor Gavin Newsom's decision to start marrying gay and lesbian couples in open defiance of supporters of Proposition 8, the

> ballot measure that later passed outlawing same-sex marriage. Lubeck said Newsom's move "was one of the key sparks" that pushed Bay Area Jews to become more vocal in their support of marriage equality. Lubeck recalls that PJA and other coalition members "came up [to City Hall] with a *ketubah*, and a big kind of posterboard and a *chuppah* to create a Jewish imprimatur for these weddings that were starting to happen, for anybody who was Jewish who wanted to have it connected to Jewish tradition, and for creating that street theater context." Lubeck said PJA also organized forums on marriage equality, recruited clergy members to speak publicly, and got voters out to the polls to vote against Proposition 8.[4]

A crucial part of the Jewish strategy in support of gay marriage was what Nietzsche called "the transvaluation of all values." Morality got redefined by the Jews, who now had the power to enforce their views through the media which they controlled. The Jews simply declared on the strength of their *ipse dixit* that sodomy was no longer a sin. Like Nazi Propaganda Minister Josef Goebbels, they repeated the lie in the media they controlled until more and more people began to believe it.

Once the Jews who control Hollywood and Wall Street were able to convince the American people that sodomy is right and opposition to sodomy wrong, they won the culture wars because those who are in error have no rights. We are witnessing a massive campaign on the national, state, and local level to use sodomy to disenfranchise the majority of the American people by overturning the millennia-long consensus of both faith and reason that sodomy is wrong. If the majority is in error when it says that sodomy is wrong, their votes and the votes of the legislators they have chosen to represent them can be disregarded, as they were in Indianapolis in March 2015, because error has no rights. As one commentator put it:

> The philosophy "error has no rights" is sound when the perceived error that faces discrimination is, in fact, error. But when error gains popular acceptance, true ideas are condemned in their stead, and truth instead of error "has no rights." . . . This is becoming increasingly true concerning issues of marriage. . . . If you would dare uphold Christian beliefs on marriage or other unpopular subjects, be warned: "Error has no rights," and you are considered to be in error.[5]

In an article in *First Things*, George Weigel noted that the notion that "error has no rights," an idea "long associated with the farther reaches of Catholic traditionalism has . . . migrated to the opposite end of the political spectrum, where it's become a rallying point for the lifestyle left," who are now using it to promote homosexual marriage. The mantra that "Error has no rights!" Weigel continues, "will, inevitably, be used to punish religious bodies that do not recognize any such thing as same-sex "'marriage.'"[6]

Weigel understates his case. The mantra "Error has no rights" is now being used not just to punish religious bodies, but to overturn representative government in the United States of America. We have seen homosexuality instrumentalized, politicized, and, in fact, weaponized as part of a campaign to disenfranchise the majority of the American voters on a national, state, and local level. This campaign is necessary because wherever the people have spoken, they have declared that marriage can only be between a man and a woman. When 19 states passed referenda affirming this fact, all of those popular initiatives were overturned by the courts. Clearly, a strategy was needed to keep the popular will from being implemented into law. The result was a three-pronged attack against the will of the majority, who felt that the laws of the land should be based on the unshakable foundation of the moral order as established by God. The logic is clear: if you say that sodomy is wrong, you are in error, and if you are in error the Jews who control Hollywood and Wall Street can ignore your voice and the voice of those you elected to office because "error has no rights."

Ever since 2009, the mainstay of Catholic defense against gay marriage has been the mantra of "religious freedom." That strategy failed to prevent gay marriage, and the victors in the gay marriage debate have set their sights on those who advocated this failed strategy. For those who have some understanding of what is going on, more will be given. For those who have not, what little they have will be taken away.

In an article which appeared on the *Catholic News Agency* website on July 29, 2015, Kevin Jones claimed that "A leader in LGBT grant-making has told business leaders that he wants to shut down the political fight for religious freedom exemptions in the U.S. within three years."[7] In a speech before the Out & Equal Workplace Advocates executive forum, held in San Francisco in late March 2015, Tim Sweeney, a former program director of the Evelyn & Walter Haas, Jr. Fund and a former president and CEO of the Gill Foundation, said "We are at a crossroads where the choices we make will mean we will fight religious exemptions for two to three years or have a protracted twenty year struggle on our hands,"

The David Bohnett Foundation, another funding source for homosexual acitivism:

> has been particularly critical of versions of the Religious Freedom Restoration Act (RFRA), including the legislation originally passed by the Indiana legislature in March 2015. After vocal opposition from LGBT activists and pressure from large businesses, the Indiana legislature changed the law in a way that drew harsh criticism from many religious freedom advocates. . . . Sweeney contended that laws like Religious Freedom Restoration Acts and decisions like the 2014 Hobby Lobby case (***Burwell v. Hobby Lobby***) are "all about using 'religious liberty' as an excuse to discriminate against LGBT people and others."

Out and Equal, Sweeney's operation, has the backing of

> 50 'high-ranking and emerging' LGBT corporate leaders at business giants like Bain & Company, Comcast, Dell, Freddie Mac, Hilton Worldwide, Oracle, and PricewaterhouseCoopers. . . . The event's presenting sponsors were the Walt Disney Company and Wells Fargo, while other leading sponsors included Deloitte, Hewlett-Packard, Intuit, and the media company Thomson Reuters.

A spokesman for the Bohnett Foundation "characterized Catholic, evangelical, and Mormon leaders as 'among our greatest adversaries' and said that "evangelical and fundamentalist groups that teach homosexuality is a sin" are those who "stand in the way of fairness and equality." The Religious Freedom Restoration Act debacle in Indiana showed that concern for homosexual rights is really a cover for overturning the moral law, the last vestiges of representative government, and "religious freedom." In an article which appeared in, of all places, *First Things*, the quondam flagship of Neoconservatism, Notre Dame Professor Patrick J. Dineen wrote:

> What we saw in Indiana was not just a "miscalculation" by Republicans. We saw fully unmasked just who runs America, and the kind of America that they are bringing more fully into reality with every passing day. It will be an America where the powerful will govern completely over the powerless, where the rich dictate terms to the poor, where the strong are unleashed from the old restraints of culture and place, where libertarian indifference—whether in respect to economic inequality or morals—is inscribed into the national fabric, and where the unburdened, hedonic human will reign ascendant.[8]

In describing the English aristocracy who were bent on looting Church property in the 16th century, R. H. Tawney wrote that they "had their teeth in the carcass and weren't going to be whipped off by a sermon." The cabal of CEOs and their homosexual lackeys have their teeth in the carcass of the American republic, and they aren't "going to be whipped off by a sermon" on religious liberty.

The American bishops and anyone else who feels that marriage should be between a man and a woman need to recognize the source of the bad idea that has crippled the Church for more than 50 years. The source is John Courtney Murray, who confected his distorted notion of religious liberty in collaboration with Henry Luce, head of the Time/Life empire, and the CIA's doctrinal warfare program. *John Courtney Murray, Time/Life, and the American Proposition: How the CIA's Doctrinal Warfare Program Changed the Catholic Church* gives a detailed explanation of how Henry Luce coordinated the efforts of the CIA, the Time/Life empire, and John Courtney Murray, SJ, with his allies at the highest levels of the Catholic Church to change the doctrine of the Catholic Church on the relationship between church and

state. This struggle began in earnest in 1948 and reached its culmination at the Second Vatican Council with the promulgation of the document known as "Declaration on Religious Liberty." Catholic doctrine did not change. Defeated at the Council, the Americanists used their media power to win the battle over who got to interpret the council with disastrous consequences for both the Church and the world.

As Robert Blair Kaiser, *Time*'s Rome correspondent during the Second Vatican Council put it: "*Time* took sides. *Time* reporters were reporters as well as participant-observers to influence the schemas [of Vatican II]. . . . Murray was a mystery man. . . . Murray was a member of a conspiracy."

Chapter Sixteen

Catholic-Jewish Dialogue
The Gift that Keeps on Gifting

If anyone still needs proof that Catholic-Jewish dialogue is a failed experiment that has proven to be catastrophic for the Church, the world, and the Jews themselves, then I recommend a close reading of "The Gifts and Calling of God Are Irrevocable," the Vatican's "Reflection of Theological Questions pertaining to Catholic Jewish relations on the Occasion of the 50th anniversary of *Nostra Aetate*."

Before we get into any detailed analysis, it is worth noting just how the Vatican perceives its own document. Before the authors of *Gifts* (no, it would be more accurate to call the document *Gift*, in recognition of its toxic character and the fact that Cardinal Marx, its main author, is German) got to the end of the first page, the document's authors issued this caveat:

> The text is not a magisterial document or doctrinal teaching of the Catholic Church, but is a reflection prepared by the Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews on current theological questions that have developed since the Second Vatican Council. It is intended to be a starting point for further theological thought with a view to enriching and intensifying the theological dimension of Jewish–Catholic dialogue.[1]

With that convoluted apology as its starting point, Cardinal Marx and co. plunge headlong down the rabbit hole of Catholic-Jewish dialogue where equivocation reigns supreme and the principle of non-contradiction is honored more in the breach than in the observance. So, when you feel your blood pressure rising, remember that this text isn't worth the theological paper that it's written on. It is a tale told by a group of Catholic idiots, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.

The fact that this meditation isn't worth the theological paper that it's written on is the first of many startling revelations. It turns out that this celebration of *Nostra Aetate* isn't based on *Nostra Aetate* either. *Gift*'s refutation of "supersessionism," the refutation of the idea that the Jewish covenant is no longer valid, which forms the heart of *Gift*, "cannot be explicitly read into *Nostra Aetate*" (para. 39). In fact, *Gift* continues:

> This statement was instead first made with full clarity by Saint Pope John Paul II when he said during a meeting with Jewish representatives in Mainz on 17 November 1980 that the Old Covenant had never been revoked by God: "The first dimension of this dialogue, that is, the meeting between the people of God of the Old Covenant, never revoked by God ... and that of the New Covenant, is at the same time a dialogue within our Church, that is to say, between the first and the second part of her Bible" (No.3). The same conviction is stated also in the Catechism of the Church in 1993: "The Old Covenant has never been revoked" (121).

Readers of *Culture Wars* magazine are familiar with this story, and the equivocating use of the term "Old Covenant," upon which it is based. In 2008 Robert Sungenis wrote an article explaining the ambiguity in Pope John Paul II's statement which made clear that the pope was referring to the Abrahamic covenant, which included the gentiles, but not the Mosaic covenant, which had in fact been superseded. The American bishops were unaware of this. In fact, their Catechism claimed that the "Mosaic covenant was eternally valid" until the article from *Culture Wars* appeared, at which point the statement about the Mosaic covenant got dropped from the Catechism of the United States bishops.

Ignoring that fact, *Gift* makes claims that are nothing short of breathtaking. With one stroke of the pen the authors of *Gift* eliminate from discussion not only the text of *Nostra Aetate* itself but 2,000 years of Church teaching, including "*Sicut Judaeis non* . . ." the traditional teaching of the Church on the Jews, as well as the writings of the Church Fathers and the Scriptures themselves, which are full of anti-Jewish sentiment based on the firm understanding that the Church is the New Israel and that the Jews, who maintain the opposite, are "liars," who now comprise the "synagogue of Satan" (Rev 2:9). "Your father is Satan," Jesus tells the Jews in John 7, when they claim to be children of Moses. Strangely, this passage is omitted from *Gift*.

Instead of admitting that supersessionism is firmly rooted in both Scripture and Tradition, the authors of *Gift* slyly insinuate that it appeared much later:

> 17. On the part of many of the Church Fathers the so-called replacement theory or supersessionism steadily gained favour until in the Middle Ages it represented the standard theological foundation of the relationship with Judaism: the promises and commitments of God would no longer apply to Israel because it had not recognised Jesus as the Messiah and the Son of God, but had been transferred to the Church of Jesus Christ which was now the true 'new Israel', the new chosen people of God.

By locating supersessionism in the Middle Ages, the authors of *Gift* ignore the writings of the Church Fathers, who took the theory for granted because

of its firm roots in the Gospel. In an article which appeared shortly after the publication of *Gift*, Fr. John Hunwicke cites St. Leo the Great, who claims:

> *benedictionem . . . qua se filii carnis abdicant . . .*" [the Blessing of Abraham from which his children by the flesh are excluding themselves]. This is not some set-piece attack upon the Synagogue; St. Leo speaks like this quite naturally, and does not need to argue the statement, because 'Supersessionism' is the basic assumed theological substructure of the Faith he shared with the other Fathers. "Intret, intret . . ." he goes on: "let the fulness of the Gentiles enter into the family of the Patriarchs and let *them*, the children of promise, receive the Blessing". . . . The following day, St. Peter Chrysologus applies to the Jews and Gentiles the Dominical promise that the First will be Last and the Last will be First . . . I doubt if he would have approved of a phrase I read somewhere recently that the Jew is the Christian's Elder Brother. A couple of days later, St. Proclus of Constantinople says that to both Jews and Gentiles *equally* God grants salvation *through Baptism*. Another few days: S Faustus tells us that, "by Christ's working in Galilee, wine is made; that is, the Law recedes, Grace takes its place; the Shadow is removed and Truth is made clear . . . the ancient observance is transferred into the New Testament [*in novum testamentum observatio vetusta transfertur*]."

Hunwicke points out that, even as late as 1971, the editors of the Liturgy of the Hours "had not the faintest idea that they were supposed to be selecting patristic readings against a background of a Two Covenants Dogma." Hunwicke then cites the passage from *Gift* (already cited) that admits that *Nostra Aetate* itself supports supersessionism. Until Pope John Paul II gave his ambiguous homily in the synagogue in Mainz in 1980, "the supersession of the Old by the New Covenant/Testament would have seemed so clear and basic a part of the Christian hermeneutic of Scripture, the basic grammatical structure of how as Christians we read the Bible, that my examination of the texts I have just worked so laboriously through with you, would have seemed a time-wasting demonstration of the ******* obvious."[2]

Instead, the authors of *Gift* set up a straw man by analyzing one passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews, that claims that God "has no intention of proving the promises of the Old Covenant to be false, but, on the contrary, treats them as valid." Well, this is true. They are valid, through baptism, as St. Peter pointed out to the Jews he addressed in Jerusalem, as recounted at the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles. Adding the simple caveat, "through Baptism," in other words, could have spared all of us 50 years of interminable logic chopping, equivocation, and denial of the gospel—the fruits of the dialogue which *Gift* celebrates.

After knocking down the straw man which they confected out of one passage in Scripture, the authors of *Gift* then pass over in silence all of the

Scriptural passages which refute what they just said. The same St. Paul who told the Hebrews that the "promises of the Old Covenant" were still "valid," also told the Thessalonians (I Thess 2: 17-18) that the Jews are "the people who put the Lord Jesus to death, and the prophets too. And now they have been persecuting us, and acting in a way that cannot please God and makes them enemies of the whole human race."

Missing from *Gift* is any mention, much less explication, of the prime scriptural reference to supersessionism, namely, the parable of the wicked husbandman (Matt: 21:33-46) in which Christ tells the story of the tenants who, after misappropriating the vineyard they had been delegated to cultivate, refused to return it to its rightful owner, seized the owner's servants (i.e., the prophets), maltreated and even killed them, forcing the owner, in desperation, to send his son. The wicked tenants (i.e., the Jews) then killed his son (i.e., Jesus Christ), "the stone rejected by the builders that became the keystone." Just in case his audience failed to get His drift, Jesus tells the Jews: "I tell you, then, the kingdom of God will be taken from you and given to a people who will produce much fruit." This sounds like supersessionism to me. It apparently sounded that way to the Jews as well because Matthew goes on to say: "When they heard his parables, the chief priests and scribes realized he was talking about them, but though they would have liked to arrest him, they were afraid of the crowds, who looked on him as a prophet." It is impossible to claim that supersessionism had been superseded in light of a passage like this and the others we have cited, and so these passages were ignored, passed over in silence, along with every other scriptural passage which contradicts the agenda of Catholic/Jewish dialogue.

In order to make its case against supersessionism, the theological version of Mission Impossible, *Gift* has to engage in one equivocation after another, as when it says:

> The Church does not replace the people of God of Israel, since as the community founded on Christ it represents in him the fulfilment of the promises made to Israel. This does not mean that Israel, not having achieved such a fulfilment, can no longer be considered to be the people of God. "Although the Church is the new people of God, the Jews should not be presented as rejected or accursed by God, as if this followed from the Holy Scriptures" (*Nostra Aetate*, No. 4).

Gift's use of the word "Israel" in that passage is particularly bewildering. Of course, "the Church does not replace the people of God of Israel," the Church *is* the people of God of Israel, but Israel after Christ's resurrection is no longer what the Fathers would call Israel of the flesh, which now refers to the group of people who killed Christ. God didn't reject the Jews; the Jews rejected God, and because they perdure in that rejection to this day, they have willfully separated themselves from the New Israel, "the new people of God."

Gift then flirts with dual covenant theology:

> 25. Judaism and the Christian faith as seen in the New Testament are two ways by which God's people can make the Sacred Scriptures of Israel their own. The Scriptures which Christians call the Old Testament is open therefore to both ways. A response to God's word of salvation that accords with one or the other tradition can thus open up access to God, even if it is left up to his counsel of salvation to determine in what way he may intend to save mankind in each instance.

Gift can make its claim that the Jews can be saved without baptism plausible only by inventing an entirely new theological vocabulary. Just what does the term "access to God" mean? Does it mean salvation? Face time? Does it refer to the "access to God" we will all get on judgment day, when God consigns us to either heaven or hell? *Gift*'s use of terms like "access to God" lie at the heart of their attempt to circumvent the salvific role which Jesus and only Jesus can play in the economy of salvation.

But, then, just at the moment when we thought that *Gift* endorsed two covenant theologies, it goes out of its way to reject that notion explicitly:

> That his will for salvation is universally directed is testified by the Scriptures (cf. eg. Gen 12:1-3; Is 2:2-5; 1 Tim 2:4). Therefore there are not two paths to salvation according to the expression "Jews hold to the Torah, Christians hold to Christ". Christian faith proclaims that Christ's work of salvation is universal and involves all mankind. God's word is one single and undivided reality which takes concrete form in each respective historical context.

But then *Gift* proceeds to reaffirm what it just rejected when it claims that:

> The New Covenant can never replace the Old but presupposes it and gives it a new dimension of meaning, by reinforcing the personal nature of God as revealed in the Old Covenant and establishing it as openness for all who respond faithfully from all the nations (cf. Zech 8:20-23; Psalm 87).

After endorsing "the fact that Christians read the Old Testament in the light of the New, in the conviction expressed by Augustine in the indelible formula: 'In the Old Testament the New is concealed and in the New the Old is revealed' (Quaestiones in *Heptateuchum* 2, 73)," *Gift* retracts its endorsement by claiming that "This Christological exegesis can easily give rise to the impression that Christians consider the New Testament not only as the fulfilment of the Old but at the same time as a replacement for it." So if you're confused, don't worry, because apparently St. Augustine got it wrong too.

Gift's tacit acceptance of dual covenant theology leads inexorably to its acceptance of the doctrine of two truths. Dialogue has led to the conclusion that both Jews and Christians are right, even when they contradict each other:

> The document of the Pontifical Biblical Commission "The Jewish People and Their Sacred Scriptures in the Christian Bible" in 2001 therefore stated that Christians can and must admit "that the Jewish reading of the Bible is a possible one, in continuity with the Jewish Scriptures from the Second Temple period, a reading analogous to the Christian reading which developed in parallel fashion."

It then draws the conclusion: "Both readings are bound up with the vision of their respective faiths, of which the readings are the result and expression. Consequently, both are irreducible" (No. 22). If both Jewish and Catholic claims are "irreducible," then dialogue isn't possible, which brings *Gift* back to admitting there is really only one covenant after all:

> That raises the further question of how the Old and the New Covenant stand in relation to one another. For the Christian faith it is axiomatic that there can only be one single covenant history of God with humanity. The covenant with Abraham, with circumcision as its sign (cf. Gen 17), and the covenant with Moses restricted to Israel regarding obedience to the law (cf. Ex 19:5; 24:7-8) and in particular the observance of the Sabbath (cf. Ex 31:16-17) had been extended in the covenant with Noah, with the rainbow as its sign (cf. "Verbum Domini," 117), to the whole of creation (cf. Gen 9:9 ff). Through the prophets God in turn promises a new and eternal covenant (cf. Is 55:3; 61:8; Jer 31:31-34; Ez 36:22-28). Each of these covenants incorporates the previous covenant and interprets it in a new way. That is also true for the New Covenant which for Christians is the final eternal covenant and therefore the definitive interpretation of what was promised by the prophets of the Old Covenant.

If the New Covenant is "the final eternal covenant and therefore the definitive interpretation of what was promised by the prophets of the Old Covenant," then the Mosaic covenant is obsolete, but this is precisely the conclusion *Gift* refuses to draw from the logic of its own premises:

> The Church as the renewed people of God has been elected by God without conditions. The Church is the definitive and unsurpassable locus of the salvific action of God. This however does not mean that Israel as the people of God has been repudiated or has lost its mission (cf. *Nostra Aetate*, No.4). The New Covenant for Christians is therefore neither the annulment nor the replacement, but the fulfilment of the promises of the Old Covenant.

Of course, Israel, "as the people of God" hasn't lost its mission. Israel is the Church, the new people of God, but unless the New Israel and the Synagogue of Satan are one and the same entity, fulfillment also means replacement. To use Scriptural terms, "the Kingdom of God" has been taken away from the original tenants of the vineyard and given to someone else. *Gift* avoids its own conclusion by its equivocal use of the term "Israel." Obviously, Israel

cannot lose its mission. Israel is by definition the people of God, but which group inhabits this category? The Christians or the Jews? The Fathers knew the answer to this question. The evangelists knew the answer to this question. Indeed, up until 1980, no Christian presumed there was any other answer to this question, but *Gift* concludes that it's impossible to say, so Talmudic and equivocal is the argumentation in *Gift*.

Their equivocal (and, dare we say, deliberately confusing) understanding of the term "Israel" prevents the authors of *Gift* from distinguishing between the Abrahamic covenant, which has not been superseded, and the Mosaic covenant, which has:

> 33. For Jewish-Christian dialogue in the first instance God's covenant with Abraham proves to be constitutive, as he is not only the father of Israel but also the father of the faith of Christians. In this covenant community it should be evident for Christians that the covenant that God concluded with Israel has never been revoked but remains valid on the basis of God's unfailing faithfulness to his people, and consequently the New Covenant which Christians believe in can only be understood as the affirmation and fulfillment of the Old. Christians are therefore also convinced that through the New Covenant the Abrahamic covenant has obtained that universality for all peoples which was originally intended in the call of Abram (cf. Gen 12:1-3). This recourse to the Abrahamic covenant is so essentially constitutive of the Christian faith that the Church without Israel would be in danger of losing its locus in the history of salvation. By the same token, Jews could with regard to the Abrahamic covenant arrive at the insight that Israel without the Church would be in danger of remaining too particularist and of failing to grasp the universality of its experience of God. In this fundamental sense Israel and the Church remain bound to each other according to the covenant and are interdependent.

What exactly does *Gift* mean when it claims that "the Church without Israel would be in danger of losing its locus in the history of salvation"? If it means to say that Israel is the Church, or that the Church is the New Israel, we agree. If it means to say that the Church cannot achieve its salvific mission without the collaboration of the Jews who rejected Christ, it is preaching something theologically preposterous. The Jews must accept the Church via baptism in order to become part of the New Israel. *Gift* tries again and again to assert some equality between the Jews who rejected Christ and the Jews who accepted him and became the New Israel, but no equality is possible.

Gift rightly claims that the Abrahamic covenant has never been revoked—but the Mosaic covenant has. That's why the bishops of the United States had to drop the claim that "Mosaic covenant is eternally valid" from their catechism.

One of the most remarkable aspects of *Gift* is its repeated violation of the principle of non-contradiction. After muddying the waters for 35 paragraphs, Gift comes out in favor of the single covenant:

> 35. Since God has never revoked his covenant with his people Israel, there cannot be different paths or approaches to God's salvation. The theory that there may be two different paths to salvation, the Jewish path without Christ and the path with the Christ, whom Christians believe is Jesus of Nazareth, would in fact endanger the foundations of Christian faith. Confessing the universal and therefore also exclusive mediation of salvation through Jesus Christ belongs to the core of Christian faith. So too does the confession of the one God, the God of Israel, who through his revelation in Jesus Christ has become totally manifest as the God of all peoples, insofar as in him the promise has been fulfilled that all peoples will pray to the God of Israel as the one God (cf. Is 56:1-8). The document "Notes on the correct way to present the Jews and Judaism in preaching and catechesis in the Roman Catholic Church" published by the Holy See's Commission for Religious Relations with the Jews in 1985 therefore maintained that the Church and Judaism cannot be represented as "two parallel ways to salvation", but that the Church must "witness to Christ as the Redeemer for all" (No.I, 7). The Christian faith confesses that God wants to lead all people to salvation, that Jesus Christ is the universal mediator of salvation, and that there is no "other name under heaven given to the human race by which we are to be saved" (Acts 4:12).

If Jesus Christ is the universal mediator of salvation, there can be only one covenant, the New Covenant, according to which the New Israel is the Catholic Church, which ordains that baptism is necessary for salvation. Hence, the repudiation of dual covenant theology in the paragraph just cited. Case closed. Not so fast! In the next paragraph, *Gift* takes it all back when it claims:

> 36. From the Christian confession that there can be only one path to salvation, however, it does not in any way follow that the Jews are excluded from God's salvation because they do not believe in Jesus Christ as the Messiah of Israel and the Son of God.

So, to sum up, Christians are saved by believing that Christ is the Son of God, and Jews are saved by not believing that Christ is the Son of God. As I said, *Gift* honors the principle of non-contradiction more in the breach than in the observance. Instead of trying to resolve a contradiction of their own making, the authors of *Gift* throw up their hands:

> That the Jews are participants in God's salvation is theologically unquestionable, but how that can be possible without confessing Christ explicitly, is and remains an unfathomable divine mystery.

The practical result of this pointless exercise is abandonment of the Great Commission to go out and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit. That still applies, but not for the Jews, but no, wait, it does apply to the Jews because, as *Gift* affirms in paragraph 37: "There cannot be two ways of salvation, therefore, since Christ is also the Redeemer of the Jews in addition to the Gentiles." Dumbfounded by their own logic, the authors of *Gift* invoke the mystery clause once again: "Here we confront the mystery of God's work, which is not a matter of missionary efforts to convert Jews, but rather the expectation that the Lord will bring about the hour when we will all be united, "when all peoples will call on God with one voice and 'serve him shoulder to shoulder' (*Nostra Aetate*, No. 4)."

Illogical as it is, this conclusion has practical consequences. In fact, the whole point of this discussion is to reach a conclusion decided upon in advance, no matter where the logic of its theological premises led. The point of Catholic-Jewish dialogue is to leave the Jews alone in their unbelief, even if their rejection of Christ denies them salvation. This means concretely that, in the interest of peace, the Church is officially abandoning its mission to the Jews. How they justify an act of perfidy and wickedness that will lead to the damnation of countless Jewish souls is worth quoting at length:

> 40. It is easy to understand that the so-called 'mission to the Jews' is a very delicate and sensitive matter for Jews because, in their eyes, it involves the very existence of the Jewish people. This question also proves to be awkward for Christians, because for them the universal salvific significance of Jesus Christ, and consequently the universal mission of the Church, are of fundamental importance. The Church is therefore obliged to view evangelisation to Jews, who believe in the one God, in a different manner from that to people of other religions and world views. In concrete terms this means that the Catholic Church neither conducts nor supports any specific institutional mission work directed towards Jews.

So, the Jews can all go to hell, as far as *Gift* is concerned. But, wait, that's not the whole story either. The Church won't work for the conversion of the Jews, but individual Catholics can if they do it in a "humble and sensitive manner":

> While there is a principled rejection of an institutional Jewish mission, Christians are nonetheless called to bear witness to their faith in Jesus Christ also to Jews, although they should do so in a humble and sensitive manner, acknowledging that Jews are bearers of God's Word, and particularly in view of the great tragedy of the Shoah.

At this point, we can discern a closing of the Catholic mind similar to the closing of the Islamic mind which took place 1,000 years ago. What both share is a contempt for the principle of non-contradiction, which is fatal to the intellect. So much for theology. So much for reason. So much for the

Catholic synthesis of faith and reason, which the Church achieved when Aquinas solved Ibn Rushd's problem 200 years after he failed to solved it for Islamic philosophy. One of the most bitter fruits of Catholic-Jewish dialogue has been the violation of this principle of non-contradiction, a violation which has led to the closing of the Catholic mind every bit as inexorably as Ibn Rushd's doctrine of two truths (known to the Latin world as Averroeism) led to the collapse of Islamic philosophy and the subsequent thousand year-long sleep of reason.

Crippled by their commitment to the failed experiment of Catholic-Jewish dialogue and unable to articulate the position of the Church, Catholic bishops and theologians lapsed into a tacit acceptance of neo-Averroeism. *Gift*, unlike the now-repudiated Keeler statement, was unable to jettison Catholic claims to Jesus as the mediator of salvation, but because they were engaged in dialogue with the Jews, they were equally unable to dismiss the implication these claims held for the Jews. The result was neo-Averroeism. When it came to salvation there were two truths. The Christian was saved by accepting Jesus Christ as the Messiah; the Jew was saved by rejecting Jesus Christ as the Messiah. The doctrine of two truths was programmed into the notion of dialogue from the beginning.

In order to make its claim that supersessionism has been superseded, *Gift* not only has to ignore both Catholic Scripture and Tradition, it must also ignore the historical circumstances surrounding how *Nostra Aetate* came into being. *Nostra Aetate* was a battleground in a covert warfare operation that has yet to be acknowledged in any Catholic-Jewish dialogue. It may well be, as the authors of *Gift* claim, that *Nostra Aetate* has been "over-interpreted." If that is the case, the only way to interpret its enigmatic passages correctly is in the light of tradition, which is precisely what Catholic-Jewish dialogue has been avoiding for more than 50 years. The Catholic scholars who engage in dialogue with the Jews have accepted the Jewish interpretation of *Nostra Aetate* completely, seeing it as a total repudiation of 1965 years of anti-Semitism. This essentially Jewish hermeneutic prohibits them from viewing *Nostra Aetate* in the light of tradition, which is the only way to understand it correctly.

It also prevents them from interpreting *Nostra Aetate* in light of the historical circumstances surrounding its birth. As I have documented in the discussion of the Council in volume two, two Jewish agencies paid Malachi Martin to subvert the Council Fathers' intention by turning their decree on non-Christian religions into an exoneration of the Jews from the charge of deicide.[3] The Jews failed, but the document still bears the scars of that battle in ambiguous passages like the one deploring "all . . . displays of antisemitism leveled at any time or from any source against the Jews."

Malachi Martin's covert collaboration with agents from the American Jewish Committee and B'nai B'rith is pregnant with meaning for any understanding of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. If the Jews were willing to hire

double agents to subvert the Second Vatican Council, why would they not use the same methods to subvert the meaning of its documents through the manipulation of subsequent events, like Catholic-Jewish dialogue? *Gift* is so far removed from the historical reality surrounding *Nostra Aetate* that it can't even pose the right questions, much less come up with the right answers. As a result, *Gift* ignores the fact that, in the years following Vatican II, dialogue became the main vehicle for bringing the Catholic mind under Jewish control. During the post-conciliar period which *Gift* celebrates, Catholic-Jewish dialogue became a synonym for subversion of Church teaching. After years of dialogue, the USCCB, under the direction of Cardinal Keeler of Baltimore, issued a joint Catholic-Jewish statement on "Covenant and Mission" which affirmed that Jews could be saved without accepting Christ as their Savior. In May 2009, those same bishops had to issue a "clarification" which repudiated their own statement. It turns out that, upon reflection, the bishops concluded that the Mosaic covenant was no longer "eternally valid," and Jews did have to convert if they wanted to be saved after all. *Gift* makes no mention of this embarrassing *volte face* in its history of Catholic-Jewish dialogue.

Nor does it mention the content of the Jewish contribution to that dialogue. In October 2008 the synod of bishops invited a rabbi to address that august body for the first time in history. The rabbi promptly took this historical moment as an opportunity to harangue the bishops for being insufficiently zealous in their support of Israel. At a press conference after his speech, the same rabbi used the forum which the bishops had provided him to attack the memory of Pope Pius XII. *Gift*, not surprisingly, passes over this depressingly familiar sort of "dialogue" in silence.

As discussed in much more detail in Chapter 13, The Third Session of the Council, of the second volume, only the intervention of the Comte de Poncins and the Holy Spirit prevented the total subversion of *Nostra Aetate*. Poncins showed up at the Second Vatican Council in 1965 with thousands of copies of his pamphlet *Le Probleme Juif face au Concile*, which "contained a brief history of the role of Jules Isaac in the preparation of the conciliar schema on the Jewish Question, and a summary of the theses." Convinced that the Council fathers who passed the schema on the Jewish Question had not read what Jews like Isaac, Jehouda and Memmi had written about the Catholic Faith, Poncins had the novel idea of reprinting their writings. Poncins was certain that in Rome, they'd not mentioned these passages but instead spoke of Christian charity, of ecumenical unity, of common biblical filiations, of Judeo-Christian friendship, of the struggle against racism, of the martyrdom of the Jewish people.[4] Missing from the discussion at the Council were passages like Memmi's diatribe against Catholicism: "Your religion is a blasphemy and a subversion in the eyes of the Jews. Your God is to us the Devil, that is to say, the symbol and essence of all evil on earth." Jules Isaac was only slightly less intemperate than Memmi in attacking the Church, calling Matthew's Gospel

"obviously tendentious" and the responsibility of the Jews for Jesus' death "at matter of legendary belief not based on solid historical foundation," adding that "without centuries of Christian teaching, preaching, and vituperation, Hitler's teaching, propaganda, and vituperation would have been impossible," etc. Forty years later, rabbis were repeating Isaac's claims at celebrations of *Nostra Aetate*.

When it comes to Catholic-Jewish dialogue, this view is the rule, not the exception. In his book *A Moral Reckoning: the Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair* (2003), Daniel Jonah Goldhagen wrote, "For centuries the Catholic Church . . . harbored anti-Semitism at its core, as an integral part of its doctrine, its theology, and its liturgy."

Nostra Aetate celebrations are not typical of Catholic-Jewish relations. During the *Nostra Aetate* celebrations, the Jews were being irenic. The Jewish reaction to the Oberammergau Passion Play is a better indication of the legacy of *Nostra Aetate* than any "celebrations." Jewish organizations had tried to stop performances of the passion play beginning in the 1930s, but they never gained any traction until *Nostra Aetate*. Rabbi James Rudin of the American Jewish Congress (AJC), who has waged war on Oberammergau for forty years, mentioned "the positive teachings of the Second Vatican Council in 1965" as his biggest ally. In his book, *Oberammergau: The Troubling Story of the World's Most Famous Passion Play* (2000), James Shapiro claims (falsely) that *Nostra Aetate* "reversed close to two thousand years of church teaching about the collective responsibility of the Jews for Jesus's death." As we have seen, the Jews construed the Vatican II document not so much as the beginning of dialogue as the beginning of covert cultural warfare.

As James Shapiro's book makes clear, *Nostra Aetate* was one of the main weapons in the arsenal which the Jews deployed in gutting the *Oberammergau Passion Play*. The post-conciliar destruction of the *Oberammergau Passion Play* would have been impossible without the assistance of the Catholic hierarchy, who had fallen under the spell of Catholic-Jewish dialogue. As a result, *Oberammergau* fell, as James Shapiro puts it, "between the anvil of *Nostra Aetate* and the hammer of Jewish organizations."

But let's forget about theology for a while, *Gift* concludes, and let's work for practical goals, like social justice and, of course, the need to fight "anti-Semitism":

> 47. Another important goal of Jewish–Catholic dialogue consists in jointly combatting all manifestations of racial discrimination against Jews and all forms of anti-Semitism, which have certainly not yet been eradicated and re-emerge in different ways in various contexts. History teaches us where even the slightest perceptible forms of anti-Semitism can lead: the human tragedy of the Shoah in which two-thirds of European Jewry were annihilated.

One fruit of Catholic-Jewish dialogue could have been a definition of anti-Semitism. As things stand, the accusation of anti-Semitism is the main weapon Jews use against any Catholic who has the temerity to criticize them. Whether it's Israeli warplanes killing innocent women or children or Jewish participation in moral subversion, any discussion of issues which makes Jews feel uncomfortable can be immediately derailed by rolling out the anti-Semitism charge. Catholic-Jewish dialogue has been instrumental in enforcing this intolerable double standard. For more than 50 years the Catholic Church has been quick to condemn anti-Semitism without ever defining exactly what it is condemning. The definition of anti-Semitism has as a result expanded well beyond the racial and biological determinism which Pope Pius XI condemned, to the point where, as Yona Metzger has pointed out, it includes Catholicism itself. Is the Gospel of St. John anti-Semitic? Is there a difference between being anti-Jewish and anti-Semitic? Was St. John anti-Semitic or anti-Jewish? As in the social collaboration issue, dialogue is a one-way street. Daniel Jonah Goldhagen, Jules Isaac, Yona Metzger and other Jews too numerous to mention have claimed, Catholicism is responsible for the Holocaust, but to say that Jews were responsible for Bolshevism, abortion, gay marriage, or pornography is to commit the sin of anti-Semitism, even when Jews themselves make the same claim. *Gift* does nothing to eradicate this intolerable double standard, and in fact promotes it when it says:

> Because of the strong bond of friendship between Jews and Catholics, the Catholic Church feels particularly obliged to do all that is possible with our Jewish friends to repel anti-Semitic tendencies. Pope Francis has repeatedly stressed that a Christian can never be an anti-Semite, especially because of the Jewish roots of Christianity.

This is good news. It means in effect: I am a Christian; therefore, I cannot be an anti-Semite, but it doesn't really define the term. One is reminded of how the late Joe Sobran used to frame the issue: "An anti-Semite used to be someone who doesn't like Jews. Now it's someone Jews don't like." To be more precise, an anti-Semite, as the term is now used, refers to someone who criticizes Jews. This means, of course, that the Church in condemning "all . . . displays of antisemitism" has denied Catholics the right to criticize Jews, under pain of being deemed an anti-Semite. So let's raise the theological bar. Is anti-Semitism sinful? Is it anti-Semitic to say that Jews supported gay marriage? Is telling the truth an example of anti-Semitism? Is it anti-Semitic to criticize Jews? If so, Moses was an anti-Semite. Is it anti-Semitic to refer to Jews as children of Satan? If so, Jesus was an anti-Semite. And if anti-Semitism is a sin, Jesus committed a sin, which means he was not perfect, which means he was not God. Are the Catholic dialoguers willing to accept this chain of reasoning? If not, they will have to define the term "anti-Semitism." Because, as things stand now, anti-Semitism means criticism of Jews. As of now, Jews

may not be criticized, no matter what they do, whether it is killing innocent Palestinian women or children with their air strikes or promoting moral subversion under the guise of "marriage equality" or "reproductive rights."

After failing to make their theological case, the authors of *Gift* in effect throw up their hands and say, okay, let's stop quibbling and work for social justice, or as they put it:

> 46. One important goal of Jewish-Christian dialogue certainly consists in joint engagement throughout the world for justice, peace, conservation of creation, and reconciliation. In the past, it may have been that the different religions – against the background of a narrowly understood claim to truth and a corresponding intolerance – contributed to the incitement of conflict and confrontation. But today religions should not be part of the problem, but part of the solution. Only when religions engage in a successful dialogue with one another, and in that way contribute towards world peace, can this be realised also on the social and political levels. Religious freedom guaranteed by civil authority is the prerequisite for such dialogue and peace. In this regard, the litmus-test is how religious minorities are treated, and which rights of theirs are guaranteed. In Jewish-Christian dialogue the situation of Christian communities in the state of Israel is of great relevance, since there – as nowhere else in the world – a Christian minority faces a Jewish majority. Peace in the Holy Land – lacking and constantly prayed for – plays a major role in dialogue between Jews and Christians.

This is the most delusionary passage in the entire document. Unlike the project of achieving a common understanding of the two covenants and the role of Christ in Salvation history, collaboration for social justice is theoretically possible. Unfortunately, it never happens. Whenever the Catholics asked the Jews for help in protecting religious liberty, they were coldly rebuffed. Instead, all of the major Jewish organizations signed a friend of the court brief demanding that the Obama administration allow the Catholic Church no exemptions of conscience when it comes to hiring homosexuals or evading mandatory coverage of abortion and contraception. So much for a common understanding of religious freedom.

Actions speak louder than words. In spite of all the dialogue, there was no collaboration in the area of religious freedom and freedom of conscience when it came to the health bill and the concerns it raised for Catholics. Beyond that, the intent behind Jewish support of the homosexual agenda became crystal clear: use "tolerance" to create a homosexual fifth column within the Catholic Church, one which, because of the nature of its sexual activities, can be used to create a whole new series of lawsuits. With Elder Brothers like this, who needs enemies?

In keeping with *Gift*'s call for "joint engagement throughout the world for justice, peace, conservation of creation, and reconciliation," the American Catholic Bishops issued an appeal "to religious allies and all people of good will who want to work together toward a culture of purity that upholds the dignity of every person and the sacredness of human sexuality" in their recent pastoral letter on pornography.[5]

The Jews would seem to be the ideal co-belligerents in this fight because, as a Jewish magazine recently put it, "Everyone knows that the Porn Industry is run by the Jews. . . ."[6] This is clearly a false statement. What the author should have said is that "Everyone but Catholic bishops knows that the porn Industry is run by the Jews." As a result, the bishops' statement is long on the therapeutic but short on causality.

It wasn't always this way. Once upon a time Catholics knew how to name their enemies in the Culture Wars, especially in the crucial battle over obscenity. During the 1930s the Catholic Church interdicted smut at its source by reining in the Jews who ran Hollywood.

The story began in the 1880s, when roughly two million Jews left Russia and emigrated to the United States. No other group of immigrants would have a comparable impact on American culture. When the Jews began to arrive, America was Protestant. By the end of the 20th century America had become Jewish, even if Jews made up less than two percent of the total population of the United States.

By the 1920s, Protestants realized the Jews were continuing the bad habits that caused conflict in Russia, as discussed in detail in chapter nine of volume two. As in Russia, Jewish involvement in alcohol production was an issue, but the real issue was pornography, and Jews had been major players in the obscenity trade since their arrival in America, and before that, in Poland and in the Pale of the Settlement in Russia. The battle over obscenity in the 1920s was fought along Catholic-Jewish lines as Catholic prosecutors strove to keep Jews from using the mails to distribute obscenity.

In *The International Jew*, Henry Ford complained about the takeover of Broadway theater. But the Jews, he continued, never had "to drive the Gentiles out of" the film industry, "because the Gentiles never had a chance to get in it." In 1924, Ford claimed that "the motion picture influence of the United States, of the whole world, is exclusively under the control, moral and financial, of the Jewish manipulation of the public mind." Echoing Ford's concerns, many legislatures in the 1920s threatened to implement government censorship of the movies. The Hays commission tried and failed.

In *The International Jew*, Henry Ford noted that the Jews never had "to drive the Gentiles out of" the film industry, "because the Gentiles never had a chance to get in it." In 1924, he asserted that "the motion picture influence of the United States, of the whole world, is exclusively under the control, moral and financial, of the Jewish manipulation of the public mind." In 1929,

Hollywood went deeply into debt to finance its transition to talking pictures. After the stock market crash, the studios were pressed to cut costs and simultaneously increase box office receipts. Hollywood turned increasingly to sex and obscenity to get people into the theaters, but this incurred the ire of Catholics.

In August 1933, A. H. Giannini, the Catholic banker who headed Bank of America, Hollywood's most significant source of credit, informed Hollywood producers he would no longer fund films "prostituting the youth of America." One year later, Dennis Cardinal Dougherty of Philadelphia announced a boycott of that city's movie theaters, most of which were owned by Warner Brothers. As a result of the boycott, Warner Brothers lost $175,000 a week at the height of the Depression. Joe Breen, who ran the Production Code office for the next 20 years, was a Catholic with no illusions about the Hollywood elite:

> They are simply a rotten bunch of vile people with no respect for anything beyond the making of money . . . Here [in Hollywood] we have Paganism rampant and its most virulent form. Drunkenness and debauchery are commonplace. Sexual perversion is rampant . . . . any number of our directors and stars are perverts. . . . The Jews seem to think of nothing but moneymaking and sexual indulgence. The vilest kind of sin is a common indulgence hereabouts and the men and women who engage in this sort of business are the men and women who decide what the film fare of the nation is to be. They and they alone make the decision. Ninety-five percent of these folks are Jews of an Eastern European lineage. They are probably the scum of

No one is expecting the American bishops to speak with the frankness Breen reserved for private correspondence with Fr. Lord and the Catholic bishops. But it's worth asking whether Catholic-Jewish dialogue has achieved anything as effective as the Legion of Decency in stopping the spread of obscenity.

Is pornography a problem or not? The Catholic bishops think it is serious enough to devote a pastoral letter to the effect it is having:

> As pastors of the Catholic Church, we offer this statement to give a word of hope and healing to those who have been harmed by pornography and to raise awareness of its pervasiveness and harms. In the confessional and in our daily ministry and work with families, we have seen the corrosive damage caused by pornography—children whose innocence is stolen; men and women who feel great guilt and shame for viewing pornography occasionally or habitually; spouses who feel betrayed and traumatized; and men, women and children exploited by the pornography industry. While the production and use of pornography has always been a problem, in recent years its impact has grown exponentially, in large part due to the Internet and mobile technology. Some have even described it as a public

> health crisis. Everyone, in some way, is affected by increased pornography use in society. We all suffer negative consequences from its distorted view of the human person and sexuality. As bishops, we are called to proclaim anew the abundant mercy and healing of God found in Jesus Christ, our Lord and Savior, and through his Church.[7]

Pornography is so all-pervasive in American culture that it can be considered "a structure of sin."

> Erotic, over-sexualized, and pornographic images are more present in American society than ever before. It is commonplace to see these images while reading magazines and social media content, shopping online or at the mall, or watching movies and television. Mainstream entertainment itself has become hypersexualized. Novels that at one time would have been classified as "erotica" are now mainstream, to say nothing of the overtly sexual romance novel genre. Video games, music lyrics, music videos, clothing, and even costumes have become progressively more sexualized, including content targeted to children and adolescents.

Pornography is big business:

> Pornography is a big business. Estimates of revenue stretch easily into the billions of dollars every year. The pornography industry is aggressive, savvy, and regulated only sporadically, even though child pornography or content that is considered "obscene" is illegal to make, sell, own, or view. Many companies invest heavily in lobbyists to push "free speech" ordinances to counter legal charges of indecency and obscenity. Pornographers often use free online content as bait to entrap and addict new users who will then pay to access "exclusive" material. Marketers target young men especially with sexual ads on popular sports and social media websites. Other businesses, such as hotel chains, cable companies, and drugstores, profit greatly from the widespread use of pornography and contribute to its accessibility. The pornography industry and its pervasive reach is a clear sign that pornography has become a structure of sin in our society.

Pornography is an addiction.

> Both science and personal testimonies confirm that many people who start by occasionally viewing pornography later become compulsive viewers who feel trapped in a cycle of fantasy, ritual, acting out, and despair. Viewing pornography, usually combined with masturbation, directly affects the brain's reward pathways and has been noted to have a similar effect on the brain as cocaine does on a person with a drug addiction or as alcohol on a person with an alcohol addiction. After using pornography, the person craves more, and over time seeks out a higher number of and/or more extreme images to get the same "high." A person addicted to pornography may become obsessed with viewing

> pornography, may take increased risks to view it (such as accessing it at work), may continue viewing it despite adverse consequences to self and others, and may feel out of control or helpless to stop. He or she may also deny that a problem exists. While pornography addiction can happen via free online content, compulsive pornography users may spend large amounts of money on "exclusive" online content, go to strip clubs, or solicit prostitution. The moral culpability of an addicted person may be lessened depending on the circumstances, but the situation is particularly grave. Addictions are very hard to overcome, and help is needed to regain one's freedom. We invite the many good men and women who suffer from addiction to pornography to trust in the Lord's mercy and seek appropriate help, support, and resources.

The bishops propose a number of aids in fighting the addiction to pornography, from software, which is "available for monitoring on-line activity and blocking pornographic material," to prayer, and other "tools they need to find freedom from pornography and help others do the same," but they never deal with the source of the problem, which is the Jews. When *Gift* announced that the Church was no longer working for the conversion of the Jews, they forgot to add that Catholics, by forgoing these attempts, should reconcile themselves to a world full of pornography. Conversion can mean accepting baptism, but it can also mean giving up sinful behavior. Hollywood mogul Louis B. Mayer never became a Catholic, but his friendship with Cardinal Spellman made more amenable to elevating the tone of his movies. It was this form of moral suasion—or conversion, if you will—that led to the successful implementation of the Production Code, which held obscenity at bay in America for over 30 years.

That revolution arrived in 1965, when Hollywood used the holocaust film *The Pawnbroker* to break the Production Code. At the crucial moment when the revolution broke out, the Catholic bishops lost their nerve on a number of fronts. Following *Griswold v. Connecticut*, the Supreme Court decision legalizing the sale of contraceptives, the Catholic bishops stopped contesting birth control in the public sphere at around the time they stopped contesting Hollywood's use of nudity and obscenity as weapons in the culture wars.

They did this largely because of their misunderstanding of one of the key documents of the Second Vatican Council, which ended in the *annus mirabilis* of 1965 as well. Relying on John Courtney Murray's notes to the Abbott edition of the council's documents, the Catholic bishops accepted the Americanist understanding of the separation of church and state, relegating the Catholic Church to the status of one sect among many.

The Catholic Church lost the Culture Wars in 1965 when it failed to block pornography. Within seven years, hard-core pornographic films like *Deep Throat* and the *Devil in Miss Jones* were being shown in first run theaters, and Jewish power over the culture increased accordingly. As a result of the

mainstreaming of films like *Deep Throat*, pornography became a weapon in America's psychological warfare arsenal. Pornography was used to topple the Communist government which had taken over Portugal in the wake of Salazar's death in 1974. It was used as a crucial part of the American invasion of Panama in December 1989. It was used by the Israelis during their occupation of Gaza in 2002. Iraq was flooded with pornography after the American invasion of 2003, and it was used as a weapon in Iran.

Since we are now enjoying such good relations with the Jews, wouldn't it be a good idea to use the next Catholic-Jewish dialogue session to ask the Jews to do something about pornography? Or would the American Catholic bishops be guilty of anti-Semitism simply by the fact that they raised the question? The sad reality is that the bishops would accuse themselves of anti-Semitism by simply entertaining the thought that "Everyone knows that the Porn Industry is run by the Jews. . . ."[8] This was the reaction when I raised the question in 2003. I made this claim in an article entitled "Rabbi Dresner's dilemma," and because I made it I was denounced as an anti-Semite. One year later, Professor Nathan Abrams reworked my article and issued it in *The Jewish Quarterly*.[9] Needless to say, he was not denounced as an anti-Semite, even though the gist of both articles was identical. The difference lay not in content but in world view. I took the Catholic position condemning pornography; Abrams' view could be summarized best by the subhead: "What are we ashamed of?" According to Professor Abrams:

> there's no getting away from the fact that secular Jews have played (and still continue to play) a disproportionate role throughout the adult film industry in America. Jewish involvement in pornography has a long history in the United States, as Jews have helped to transform a fringe subculture into what has become a primary constituent of Americana. These are the 'true blue Jews'.

Jewish activity in the porn industry divides into two (sometimes overlapping) groups: pornographers and performers. Though Jews make up only two per cent of the American population, they have been prominent in pornography. Many erotica dealers in the book trade between 1890 and 1940 were immigrant Jews of German origin. According to Jay Gertzman, author of *Bookleggers and Smuthounds*, "Jews were prominent in the distribution of *gallantiana* [fiction on erotic themes and books of dirty jokes and ballads], avant-garde sexually explicit novels, sex pulps, sexology."[10]

Why were Jews involved in porn? Abrams starts by giving the usual reasons:

> Jews became involved in the porn industry for much the same reasons that their co-religionists became involved in Hollywood. They were attracted to an industry primarily because it admitted them. Its newness meant that restrictive barriers had not yet been erected, as they had in so many other areas of American life. In porn, there was no discrimination against

> Jews. During the early part of the twentieth century, an entrepreneur did not require large sums of money to make a start in the film business; cinema was considered a passing fad. In the porn business, it was similarly straightforward to get going. To show 'stag' movies or loops, as they were known, all one needed was a projector, screen, and a few chairs. Not tied up with the status quo and with nothing to lose by innovation, Jews were open to new ways of doing business. Gertzman explains that "Jews, when they found themselves excluded from a field of endeavour, turned to a profession in which they sensed they could eventually thrive by cooperating with colleagues in a community of effort . . . Jews have for a very long time cultivated the temperament and talents of middlemen, and they are proud of these abilities."[11]

But then he gets to the heart of the matter. Citing "E. Michael Jones in the magazine *Culture Wars* (May 2003)," Abrams concludes that there is a "deeper reason, beyond the mere financial as to why Jews in particular have become involved in porn":

> Jewish involvement in porn, by this argument, is the result of an atavistic hatred of Christian authority: they are trying to weaken the dominant culture in America by moral subversion. Astyr remembers having 'to run or fight for it in grammar school because I was a Jew. It could very well be that part of my porn career is an "up yours" to these people'. Al Goldstein, the publisher of *Screw*, said (on lukeford.net), 'The only reason that Jews are in pornography is that we think that Christ sucks. Catholicism sucks. We don't believe in authoritarianism.' Pornography thus becomes a way of defiling Christian culture and, as it penetrates to the very heart of the American mainstream (and is no doubt consumed by those very same WASPs), its subversive character becomes more charged. Porn is no longer of the 'what the Butler saw' voyeuristic type; instead, it is driven to new extremes of portrayal that stretch the boundaries of the porn aesthetic. As new sexual positions are portrayed, the desire to shock (as well as entertain) seems clear.[12]

Abrams then adopts the thesis of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* as the best explanation of why Jews are involved in the production of pornography:

> Just as Jews have been disproportionately represented in radical movements over the years, so they are also disproportionately represented in the porn industry. Jews in America have been sexual revolutionaries. A large amount of the material on sexual liberation was written by Jews. Those at the forefront of the movement which forced America to adopt a more liberal view of sex were Jewish. Jews were also at the vanguard of the sexual revolution of the 1960s. Wilhelm Reich, Herbert Marcuse, and Paul Goodman replaced Marx, Trotsky, and Lenin as required revolutionary reading. Reich's central preoccupations were work, love, and sex, while

> Marcuse prophesied that a socialist utopia would free individuals to achieve sexual satisfaction. Goodman wrote of the 'beautiful cultural consequences' that would follow from legalizing pornography: it would 'ennoble all our art' and 'humanize sexuality'. Pacheco was one Jewish porn star who read Reich's intellectual marriage of Freud and Marx (lukeford.net): "Before I got my first part in an adult film, I went down to an audition for an X-rated film with my hair down to my ass, a copy of Wilhelm Reich's *Sexual Revolution* under my arm and yelling about work, 'love and sex'."

So why am I an anti-Semite when I claim that "Everyone knows that the Porn Industry is run by the Jews"? The short answer to that question is Catholic-Jewish dialogue. As I said, Catholic-Jewish dialogue has been a disaster for the Catholic Church.

After years of failure, I have concluded that the only way to win the Culture Wars is to convert the Jews, who are responsible for so much cultural pathology, from abortion to gay marriage to pornography to wars in the Middle East. My program, if we can call it that, is based on the first chapters of the Acts of the Apostles. The only theologically based mandate for dialogue with the Jews is found in the Acts of the Apostles. When Peter addressed the men of Jerusalem in the wake of the Pentecost, he didn't mince his words:

> Men of Israel, listen to what I am going to say. Jesus the Nazarene was a man commended to you by God by the miracles and portents and signs that God worked through him when he was among you, as you all know. This man, who was put into your power by the deliberate intention and foreknowledge of God, you took and had crucified by men outside the Law. You killed him, but God raised him to life . . . For this reason, the whole House of Israel can be certain that God has made this Jesus, whom you crucified, both Lord and Christ (Acts 2:22).

When the pope's predecessor spoke to the Jews in that manner, the Jews were "cut to the heart" and asked Peter and the Apostles, "What must we do, brothers?" Peter's answer was clear: "You must repent, and every one of you must be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of your sins, and you will receive the Holy Spirit. The promise that was made is for you and your children, and for all those who are far away, for all those whom the Lord Our God will call to himself. "

Peter spoke to the Jews "for a long time using many arguments and he urged them, 'Save yourselves from this perverse generation.'" And how did the Jews react? Did they complain because Peter accused them of killing Christ? Did they quibble over the use of "murdered" versus "killed"? Did they complain about his pronunciation of the Greek? Did they complain because he didn't mention the sins committed by Christians against Jews? Did they say that he should have stayed home? No, quite to the contrary, "They were convinced

by his arguments, and they accepted what he said and were baptized." In fact, "That very day about three thousand were added to their number."

Baptism is the one word answer to every question *Gift* raises but cannot answer. If the Church does not say something like this in some recognizable form when she meets with the Jews, then she is not preaching the Gospel. And if the Church is not preaching the Gospel, then her words, no matter how noble in intention, will have no effect, because conversion is the only solution to the world's ongoing Jewish problem.

Chapter Seventeen

Who Shtupped the Shiksa?
Harvey Weinstein Creates Moral Panic in Hollywood

There was something odd about the Harvey Weinstein scandal. It was clearly an instance of moral panic. People who once felt bad about themselves could now feel good about themselves because they denounced Harvey Weinstein, whose fall from the pinnacle of Hollywood power inspired feelings of fear and pity. Fear was especially apparent among the male actors who had refused to denounce him earlier. Pity . . . Well, pity wasn't really part of this tragedy, and so it wasn't as cathartic as it could have been if, say, Euripedes had written the script and Aristotle was in charge of interpreting it for us.

But what genre were we dealing with? It certainly wasn't tragedy because Harvey Weinstein, unlike Oedipus or Hippolytus or Pentheus, had no redeeming qualities. Harvey Weinstein was a bad person. He was, in every sense of the term, a Hollywood villain. He certainly looked the part: a fat, ugly, dirty old man slobbering over innocent starlets, who, like Claude Rains in *Casablanca*, were "shocked, shocked" to discover that a Hollywood producer who invited a young actress up to his hotel room might have something other than script revisions on his mind. The fall of Harvey Weinstein may have fallen short of tragedy, but it was the best Hollywood could do under the circumstances. Given the short notice, Hollywood was forced to produce a feminist psychodrama. It was, therefore, about "one man," one ugly, old, fat guy who made Jabba the Hutt look attractive by comparison, who forced himself on a number of courageous 20-year-old feminists, who to a man resisted his advances.

We have seen this movie many times. In virtually every instance mentioned in the *New York Times* article, the ingénue from Ohio reacted with horror when Harvey made improper advances. (This part is certainly believable.) At that point, she slapped him in the face and stalked out of his suite in the Peninsula Hotel, as he shouted behind her "You'll never work in this town again." How can we argue against something we have seen so many times? Hollywood could have produced this film when Joe Breen was head of the

Production Code. It was such a celebration of feminine chastity that, before long, I started to feel sorry for Weinstein, who was evidently the only guy in Hollywood who couldn't get laid.

But then I began to wonder? Did any of the Bacchae who called for his dismemberment actually have sex with Harvey? Weinstein seemed to indicate that this was the case when his press secretary released a statement that any sex he might have had was consensual. So, it seems there was some sexual activity, even if none of it appeared in the *New York Times* article, which took the feminist line and portrayed the women who wandered into his hotel suite at the Peninsula as heroically resisting his advances. A quick survey of the Internet, however, indicated that virtually every woman who accused Weinstein of sexual harassment—including Rose McGowan, who accused him of rape—had a sex tape on the Internet. Roughly one year before the Weinstein scandal broke, Rose McGowan was portrayed in the British press as "the victim of a sex tape leak."[1] In fact, after a quick survey of the names which appeared in the *New Yorker* article, it looked as if Harvey Weinstein was one of the few people that Rose McGowan, *et al*, did not have sex with. Before long, the Hollywood paradigm—courageous ingénue from Ohio slaps dirty old man in the face and stalks out—proved more and more inadequate the more it got stretched to cover the facts.

A week into the Harvey Weinstein news cycle, Kate Winslet joined the chorus, which by then included Meryl Streep, Judi Dench, and Glenn Close, and soon after that, Rose McGowan upgraded her charge to rape. Winslet praised the women who "are starting to speak out about the gross misconduct of one of most important and well-regarded film producers" as "incredibly brave." She then goes on to:

> fully embrace and salute their profound courage, and I unequivocally support this level of very necessary exposure of someone who has behaved in reprehensible and disgusting ways. His behaviour is without question disgraceful and appalling and very, very wrong. I had hoped that these kind of stories were just made up rumours, maybe we have all been naïve. And it makes me so angry. There must be 'no tolerance' of this degrading, vile treatment of women in *any* workplace anywhere in the world [her emphasis].

Before long I began to fear that Winslet, who had won an Oscar for her role in *The Reader*, a holocaust movie produced by Weinstein, "doth protest too much." In her press release, Winslet went out of her way to claim that she did not thank Weinstein during her Academy Awards acceptance speech. What she did not tell us is whether she had to sleep with Weinstein to get the role. Whether she did or didn't her statement is full of the suppressed rage that is often an indication of self-loathing, something which came out shortly after she received her award when she reportedly said that she deserved the

Oscar because she had now done her "fucking holocaust movie." Was Winslet having pangs of conscience because she had been dragooned into working for the public relations arm of the Holocaust Industry, otherwise known as Hollywood? Or was it the sex scenes with a minor? Either way the suppressed anger was a function of shame, which remains one of the many unspoken issues in the Weinstein drama.

Purity, according to the Catechism of the Catholic Church, "requires modesty, an integral part of temperance. Modesty protects the intimate center of the person. It means refusing to unveil what should remain hidden. It is ordered to chastity to whose sensitivity it bears witness. It guides how one looks at others and behaves toward them in conformity with the dignity of persons and their solidarity."[2] Modesty "protests. . . against the voyeuristic explorations of the human body in certain advertisements, or against the solicitations of the certain media that go too far in the exhibition of intimate things. Modesty inspires a way of life which makes it possible to resist the allurements of fashion and the pressures of prevailing ideologies."[3] Purity of heart, the Catechism continues, "brings freedom from widespread eroticism and avoids entertainment inclined to voyeurism and illusion."

Which brings us back to Kate Winslet and *The Reader*. Whether Winslet slept with Weinstein to get the role is ultimately irrelevant because she debased herself sufficiently by doing the film, which was a combination of Holocaust propaganda and "child pornography." That's not my verdict; it is the conclusion which the reviewer at the *Huffington Post* drew after viewing:

> the passionate post-war affair between a 36-year-old female German tram conductor Hanna (Winslet) and a dewy 15-year-old virgin Michael (David Kross). During their multiple, wonderfully lit, detailed erotic scenes, we see plenty of bare gorgeous Winslet indoctrinating the equally nude boy into the ways of slow sex that please a woman, and leave a man satisfied as well. . . . Michael is a victim of abuse, and his abuser just happened to have been a luscious retired Auschwitz guard. You can call their tryst and its consequences a metaphor of two generations of Germans passing guilt from one to the next, but that doesn't explain why filmmakers Daldry and Hare luxuriated in the sex scenes—and why it's so tastefully done audiences won't see it for the child pornography it is.[4]

Winslet, like virtually all of the women who ended up on the receiving end of Harvey's advances, showed up in his hotel room to get the privilege of parading around naked in one of his films. This unsurprisingly leads to shame, and if shame goes untreated, it leads to the self-loathing that was just beneath the surface of all of the denunciations. Aquinas teaches "that the kinds of sexual acts from which generation can never follow" are "the most grave and shameful" of the various types of lust, because "they transgress that which has been determined by nature with regard to the use of venereal actions."[5]

He's referring to homosexuality, but his warning applies to any form of sexual activity divorced from procreation and outside of marriage.

So shame flows from violations of modesty, and those violations of the sixth and ninth commandments, if unrepented, lead to self-loathing. But the trajectory doesn't stop there. Shame, left to fester in un-repentance, leads to its opposite, namely shamelessness, and shamelessness leads to exhibitionism, and one of the most popular forms of exhibitionism in our day is the sex tape. So it should come as no surprise that Rose McGowan would appear on a sex tape of her own making as a way of escaping the shame she felt in her dealings with Harvey Weinstein. A Google search for "Kate Winslet sex tape" leads, unsurprisingly, to many X-rated websites, but it also leads to scenes from *The Reader*, which probably explains why the loathing she felt for Harvey Weinstein was in reality self-loathing for doing *The Reader*.

Exhibitionism is a perverse expression of shame, which goes by the name of shamelessness. By becoming crusaders for feminism, the starlets could purge themselves of the shame they felt—not so much because they succumbed to his advances and hated themselves for their weakness, as Asia Argento admitted in her *New Yorker* interview—but because they positively lusted after the opportunity to engage in exhibitionism in his films. They were involved in the same sort of psychological dynamic that led Michael Voris to become the closet homosexual crusader for Catholicism. As I wrote in the July/August 2016 issue of *Culture Wars*:

> Becoming a crusader for Catholicism was in many ways the worst thing Voris could have done after his conversion, because by putting himself in the limelight, he simply hardened and exacerbated the narcissism that lay at the root of his neurosis and was the cause of his homosexuality. In terms of recovery, van den Aardweg claims that:
>
> Any kind of infantile self-affirmation should be "frustrated"; in this way, swift progress can be made. Don't forget attempts to be "great" in one's own eyes, to excel, to be admirable. In a sense, infantile self-affirmation seems "reparative," particularly to inferiority complaints. In effect, however, it merely nourishes such complaints as it strengthens one's ego-centeredness (all infantile urges and emotions interconnect like communicating vessels; feeding one automatically strengthens the others). Mature self-affirmation, which provides a kind of joy, is contentment with being able to achieve something, not, however, because "I am so special"; partly, it is gratefulness. The mature adult is aware of the relativity of his achievements.[6]

The same psychological dynamic applies, *mutatis mutandis*, to feminism. Like Voris, the feminists luxuriated in their new role as the star at the center of a world-shaking drama of their own making, something which showed, if nothing else, their shared attachment to self-pity.

Homosexuals, according to Gerard J. M. van den Aardweg, "may seek or promote situations in which they can experience themselves as tragic heroes. Their suicidal fantasies sometimes take the form of dramatic 'protests' against others."[7] The Vortex was one long, on-going narcissistic fantasy. Voris's "apostolate" was suffused with a desire for revenge on the mother, Holy Mother Church, who rejected him when he got expelled from the seminary. Deprived of the position that his classmate Fr. Miqueli got as pastor, Voris transposed the same desires on to his "apostolate." When asked why "so many Protestant and Catholic homosexuals" were "interested in theology," and "why they not infrequently want to be ministers and priests," van den Aardweg points to "their infantile need for sympathy and contact" and:

> the enjoyment of being able to dominate others. These interests stem for the most part, then, from an infantile, self-centered imagination and have precious little to do with the objective contents of Christian belief. What some homosexuals thus see as their "calling" to the priesthood is an attraction to an emotionally rewarding, but self-centered way of life. These are self-imagined or "false" vocations [which] tend to create a homosexual subculture within their churches. There they undoubtedly pose a subtle threat for the orthodoxy and undermine church unity by their habit of forming subversive coteries that do not feel responsible to the official church community. . . . Otherwise, they generally lack the balance and the strength of character necessary for giving fatherly guidance.[8]

Just as Voris sublimated his shame at his homosexuality into hyper-Catholicism, so the Hollywood starlets sublimated their shame at being willing sex objects into a raging feminism that called for Weinstein's head. Feminism, they hoped, would succeed where the sex tapes failed in exorcising the shame they felt at being Hollywood's willing executioners. The connection between the sex tapes which virtually every actress who accused Harvey Weinstein of sexual harassment made and the moral outrage which followed his demise is perfectly understandable. The sexual behavior which Hollywood had promoted among everyone involved in this wretched industry had created a pool of guilt and shame that had become psychologically intolerable. The first reaction to this guilt and shame was exhibitionism of the sort which one now finds in gay pride marches. The logic, if we can call it that, is psychologically understandable. If I act out what causes me shame in a really public way, and God doesn't strike me dead, then whatever is causing my shame is really just a figment of my imagination, and this shows that I'm not a bad person after all.

This applies to all forms of exhibitionism: from sex tapes to gay pride marches to Hollywood films to classics of American literature like Nathaniel Hawthorne's *The Scarlet Letter*. I once called the psychological dynamic at work here the Dimmesdale Syndrome, after the guilt-ridden minister in that

novel. Dimmesdale feels compelled to confess his sin, but he can't do it either publicly or sacramentally because according to the tenets of Puritan theology he is a saint. But for those who cannot repent, there is always exhibitionism. Dimmesdale climbs onto the scaffold where Hester Prynne was condemned and exposes the letter on his own chest, but at midnight when no one can see him. The result is disappointing. The guilt remains, until the end when he mounts the scaffold again, exposes his guilt and dies.

Hollywood is the main purveyor of exhibitionism in our day, but our culture is suffused with other manifestations as well. Virtually every gay pride march is an excuse for exhibitionism, as are manifestations of cultural decadence like Mardi Gras in New Orleans, Fantasy Fest in Key West, the Mermaid Parade in Coney Island, and others too numerous to mention. All are driven by the same psychological dynamic, namely, that shamelessness is the best cure for shame.

Demonstrations of guilt-driven shamelessness can occur spontaneously as well, as happened in Seattle when a group of prolifers tried to buy coffee at a shop owned by a homosexual after an afternoon of leafleting.[9] After years of hearing how intolerant they were, the prolifers were shocked to hear Ben Borgman, the homosexual owner of the café announce, "I'm gay. You have to leave." "Are you denying us service?" activist Caytie Davis asked.

"I am. Yeah," Borgman replied.

What began as a classic violation of virtually every city and state's civil rights statutes soon became an excuse for guilt-fueled exhibitionism.

"Can you tolerate my presence?" Borgman bellowed at the bemused prolifers.

"If I go get my boyfriend and fuck him in the ass right here, you're going to tolerate that? Are you going to tolerate it?"

"That would be your choice," Sutherland replied.

"Answer my fucking question!" Borgman yelled back. "No, you're going to sit right here and fucking watch it! Leave, all of you! Tell all your fucking friends don't come here!"

As the group prepared to leave, one of the women in the group told Borgman, "Just know that Christ can save you from that lifestyle."

To which, Borgman responded: "Yeah, I like ass. I'm not going to be saved by anything. I'd f*** Christ in the ass. Okay? He's hot."[10]

Exhibitionism isn't an effective alternative to sacramental confession. Sexual sin leads to shame; shame leads to guilt; guilt, if un-repented, leads to shamelessness; shamelessness leads to exhibitionism, and, as the coffee shop owner demonstrated, exhibitionism leads to violence, or in the case of Harvey Weinstein, a witchhunt, moral panic, and the desperate search for a scapegoat who can take upon himself the guilt of his accusers by being sacrificed on the altar of, in this instance, the Goddess Feminism. As a result, the slew of sex tapes compounded the guilt until finally the pressure got so great that an

explosion of moral panic was inevitable, and Harvey Weinstein was chosen as the scapegoat onto which the guilt of the Jewish people who run Hollywood could be projected as a prelude to his death, symbolic or otherwise.

Before that could happen, Harvey had to be expelled from the synagogue, or in this instance, the organizations which had honored him by making him a member. As the moral panic surrounding Weinstein's actions grew, the same people who fell all over themselves to get their picture taken with him when he was the Hollywood power broker, now clambered to denounce him. Politicians who had sought him out now loudly announced that they were going to give the money he had contributed to their campaigns to "charity," i.e, a feminist organization. Loudest among suddenly indignant politicians was none other than Hillary Clinton, who was shocked, shocked to learn that a man of his stature would engage in inappropriate touching. One can imagine her expressing her bewilderment that a man could do such a thing to her husband Bill, who may or may not have returned the money he got from Harvey.

Not long after Hillary's outburst, the organizations which had showered honors on Harvey for championing things like women's rights and general benevolence began announcing that they were taking back their awards. Two members of the House of Lords in England petitioned the Queen to rescind Harvey's membership in the Commanders of the British Empire. The British Academy of Film and Television Arts soon followed suite. Then, on October 14, the other shoe dropped, and Weinstein found himself "expelled from the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences in response to mounting allegations of sexual harassment and assault against him."[11] According to an account in the *Los Angeles Times*:

> The film academy's 54-member board of governors, which includes such industry luminaries as Steven Spielberg, Tom Hanks, Kathleen Kennedy, and Whoopi Goldberg, voted in an emergency meeting on Saturday morning to remove Weinstein from the organization's ranks in an unprecedented public rebuke of a prominent industry figure. The move marked the latest blow in Weinstein's stunning downfall and, in symbolic terms, amounts to a virtual expulsion from Hollywood itself.[12]

In removing Weinstein from its ranks, the academy said in a statement, "We do so not simply to separate ourselves from someone who does not merit the respect of his colleagues but also to send a message that the era of willful ignorance and shameful complicity in sexually predatory behavior and workplace harassment in our industry is over. What's at issue here is a deeply troubling problem that has no place in our society. The Board continues to work to establish ethical standards of conduct that all Academy members will be expected to exemplify."

A statement like this, coming from Steven Spielberg, the inventor of Holocaust Porn, is a classic instance of the pot calling the kettle black. Because he was involved in the same industry producing the same sort of material, Spielberg's dread of guilt by association got the best of him, and he was forced to denounce one of his own. Why was there so much panic? Why was everyone being so hard on Harvey? The answer to this question could be found among the forebears of people like Steven Spielberg, the people who once said, "It is better for one man to die than that the people should perish." The academy needed a scapegoat, and Harvey was it. If all of this hanky panky could be attributed to one man, the narrative wasn't about an industry where this sort of behavior was the rule and not the exception. No, it was about one man, who had to be expelled from the synagogue to prove how morally pure those who expelled him were. So it would be better for the entertainment industry if Harvey Weinstein could be expelled in one outburst of moral indignation rather than let the suspicion linger that Hollywood was rotten from top to bottom. Feminism was the goddess the Hollywood moguls chose to propitiate, and they did this by throwing Weinstein into the volcano of public opinion which had erupted in a blast of moral outrage.

Spielberg's intervention as head of the Academy came not a moment too soon. The pundits were starting to feel the Weinstein scandal might involve more than one lone deranged dirty old man. Kyle Smith wrote that the "Weinstein debacle has implicated more or less everyone in Hollywood who knew about the abhorrent behavior and remained silent, which must mean just about everyone in Hollywood."[13] Emma Thompson claimed that Weinstein was just the "tip of the iceberg."[14] Kevin Blatt, "a celebrity crisis manager," also mentioned this mysterious iceberg; "the Weinstein drama is just the beginning of what will be more accusations against powerful men in Hollywood. . . . 'There will be many industry women looking to expose those who wronged them in the past. This is just the tip of the iceberg."[15] So what is the "iceberg"? Is it something Jewish, like Katzenberg or Spielberg?

The answer is yes. The Iceberg is Jewish. Weinstein may have had his CBE and his membership in the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences revoked, but his humanitarian of the year award for 2015 from the Simon Wiesenthal Center was safe, even if just barely.[16] Moved by the chorus of aggrieved starlets, Rabbi Marvin Hier, founder and dean of the Simon Wiesenthal Center, issued a statement claiming that everyone at what billed itself as his "human rights organization" was "horrified by the charges leveled against Harvey Weinstein by so many people." The rabbi, who happens to reside in Los Angeles, was shocked, shocked to learn that a Jewish movie producer could engage in something as heinous as couch casting. "Given the gravity of the accusations," Hier continued, wiping the crocodile tears from his eyes, "we are removing his name from our distinguished roster of honorees in all our future publications." And how did Weinstein land on that

"distinguished roster"? Well, by giving money to the Simon Wiesenthal Center when everyone in Hollywood thought he was a *macher* and the quintessential Jewish philanthropist. Weinstein, according to the same statement, "received the award due in part to his contributions to the group, which have totaled nearly $100,000," not including that year's dinner which brought in $1.75 million alone.

"Obviously," Rabbi Hier opined, without giving any indication that he was going to donate Weinstein's money to "charity," "we can't go back in time, but had we known then what we know now, we would have never honored him, because such egregious behavior is against everything the Museum of Tolerance and the Wiesenthal Center stands for and is in contradiction to the text of the award he received: 'Who is honored, he who honors mankind.'"

At that year's induction ceremony, Hollywood mogul Jeffrey Katzman introduced Weinstein as "a nice Jewish boy." It was the first time the word Jew got mentioned, which was in keeping with the notion that all of this horrendous wrong-doing was the work of one isolated individual, not unlike the "lone, deranged gunman" who shot President Kennedy or the man who killed 59 people in Las Vegas. Once the crime can be limited to one isolated individual, there is no reason for further soul-searching, especially if that individual kills himself, as Mr. Paddock did, or is killed by an accomplice of the greater conspiracy, as Lee Harvey Oswald was. The fact that Lee Harvey Oswald did it meant that there was *ipso facto* no conspiracy. The fact that the Academy expelled Harvey Weinstein did something similar to the regime which runs Hollywood. It proved that it is better that one man should die than that the people perish.

But if we go back to the acceptance speech that Harvey gave when the Simon Wiesenthal Center gave him its humanitarian award, it is clear that Harvey was not acting alone. In fact, he identified himself fully with the group that honored him. During his acceptance speech, Weinstein said that Jews need to learn how to imitate the mafia so that they can go out and "kick the anti-Semite's ass."[17]

He said this, of course, without defining the term anti-Semite, something which used to refer to people who didn't like Jews but now refers to people Jews don't like. In case you were wondering, that means people like me—and you, since you are reading this. In conferring their Humanitarian of the Year award on Weinstein, the Simon Wiesenthal Center was blessing Weinstein's efforts to do their dirty work for them and go after anyone Jews don't like, which is the current and most accurate definition of an anti-Semite. Rabbi Hier, it should be remembered, is responsible for the fact that Alexander Solzhenitsyn's book on the Jews *Dvesti let Vmesti* ("Two Hundred Years Together") never got translated into English by any of New York's major publishing houses. The Simon Wiesenthal Center was part of a web of Jewish organizations which conferred awards on wealthy Jews seeking legitimacy in exchange for cash

donations. The tradition goes back to Jewish criminals like Meyer Lansky and Moe Dalitz, who received the Anti-Defamation League's Torch of Liberty award in 1982 in exchange for all of the gambling money which Dalitz had funneled into the ADL over the years. Once the ADL conferred its award on Dalitz, anyone who alleged that he was involved in criminal activity ran the danger of being called an anti-Semite. In 1984 William Webster established an alliance between the FBI and the ADL, which allowed the ADL to use the police power of the federal government to go after "hate groups," which is another word for "anti-Semites," which is another word for anyone Jews don't like.

Weinstein could kick ass for the Big Jews in two ways. He could praise them by producing Holocaust propaganda pieces like *The Reader* and *Inglourious Basterds*, and he could demonize the Jews' main enemy in the culture wars—namely, the Catholic Church—by producing a slew of anti-Catholic movies which portrayed priests and nuns as pedophile predators and hypocrites. That list of films includes:

> *Priest* (1995), a film which centers around a vampire-killing parody of the Church in which priests are depicted as misanthropic atheists; The *Butcher Boy* (1998), a film about a young boy who is molested by a priest in a reform school and is fascinated by delusional fantasies about a foul-mouthed Virgin Mary played by everyone's favorite bigot, Sinéad O'Connor; *Dogma* (1999), a confusing pastiche of Catholic beliefs, pagan myths and atheist Black Legend slapped together about the end of the world in which a descendant of Blessed Virgin Mary and St. Joseph who works in an abortion clinic; *40 Days and 40 Nights* (2002), a film which ridicules Catholics who remain celibate for Lent; *The Magdalene Sisters* (2002), which depicted lies about Irish nuns falsely portraying them as abusive toward young wayward women they had "enslaved" in their laundries; *Bad Santa* (2003), which depicted a mall Santa who was a vulgar, drunken, suicidal, chain-smoking, sex-addicted thief. Some have drawn parallels between this mockery of this children's icon and Weinstein himself; *Sin City* (2005) which depicted a Catholic bishop who aides and abets a serial murderer and engages in cannibalism; *Black Christmas* (2006) is a tiresome slasher film replete with gratuitous sex and foul language. Both Harvey and his brother Bob were remarkably hands-on with this film; *Philomena* (2013), a film based on another set of lies reminiscent of the Black Legend that insisted that "evil" nuns had kidnapped a woman's child. Actually, Philomena Lee abandoned her out-of-wedlock son when she was a teenager. It was the actions of the nuns, who often run orphanages around the world and throughout the past two millennia, who gave the child to an American couple who adopted him. Weinstein lobbied the Academy in the hope of getting an Oscar for *Philomena*.[18]

Sacrificing Harvey Weinstein as the lone, deranged scapegoat was calculated to divert our eyes from the Jewish "iceberg" in general, but it was also a form of plea bargaining for a lesser offense, which brings up the case of Bryan Singer, the Jewish homosexual director of the X-Men series, who has been accused of pedophilia. Singer used the X-men series as a platform for moral subversion on a massive scale. The central characters in that series are known as "Mutants," a Darwinian conflation of the Jew and the homosexual. This claim is based not on anti-Semitic fantasy, but on the testimony of Zack Stentz, the screen writer for X-Men First Class, who wrote:

> I helped write the movie and can tell the gay rights/post-Holocaust Jewish identity/civil rights allegory stuff was all put there on purpose. Joss Whedon designed the whole "Cure" storyline in the comic books specifically as a gay allegory, and Bryan Singer wove his own feelings of outsiderdom as a gay man into the movie series. The whole "Have you ever tried not being a mutant" coming out scene in X2 isn't even particularly subtle, while it is effective.[19]

In a BBC interview, Singer admitted that mutant was a stand in for gay in X-Men movies. Singer: "They are seen by tens of millions of people because they are those kinds of movies. For goodness sake, there's a coming out scene in X-Men 2." X-men are portrayed as "Mutants" evolving into a higher species, eclipsing *homo sapiens*. When Magneto, a Holocaust survivor played by the homosexual Ian McClellan, gives his speech it could be read as Hollywood's warning to anyone who is not homosexual or not Jewish or not willing to go along with Hollywood's agenda of moral subversion:

> You built these weapons to destroy us, why? Because you are afraid of our gifts, because we are different. Humanity has always feared that which is different. Well, I'm here to tell you, to tell the world, you're right to fear us. We are the future, we are the ones who will inherit this earth. And anyone who stands in our way will suffer the same fate as these men you see before you. Today was meant to be a display of your power, instead I give you a glimpse of the devastation my race can unleash upon yours. Let this be a warning to the world, and to my mutant brothers and sisters out there I say this. No more hiding, no more suffering. You have lived in the shadows in shame and fear for too long. Come out, join me, fight together in a brotherhood of our kind. A new tomorrow, that starts today.[20]

Not surprisingly Bryan Singer has been accused of the homosexual variation on couch casting. In the September 2014 issue of *Culture Wars*, Michael Timmons reported that:

> Singer's films are clearly influenced by his experiences as a sexual degenerate. Simon Kinberg, a film writer and producer who has worked with Singer on the X-Men movies claimed: "Bryan brings an amazing

attention and sensitivity to these characters and, I think, a real connection to what it means to be a little bit of an outsider. . . . That was the core of the X-Men in the comics; I think that's something Bryan is fascinated by, and he very actively wants to explore that dramatically."[21] Despite Singer's career success with the X-Men film series, his personal life has recently imploded with allegations of pedophilia and sexual abuse. *Time Magazine* columnist Kate Pickert examined the controversy in her article "What the Bryan Singer Scandal Says about Hollywood": "Allegations of a party scene involving hordes of barely legal young men and orchestrated by powerful gay men, like X-Men director Bryan Singer, who is accused of sexually abusing underage boys, has some declaring that the infamous casting couch still exists." In other words, Singer allegedly exploited young boys who aspired to star in his movies and become child stars: "The casting couch is as old as Hollywood itself. Ever since there have been aspiring actors eager for a chance to break into the business, there have been powerful producers and directors offering opportunity and access in exchange for sexual favors. But in the wake of accusations that X-Men director Bryan Singer sexually abused underage boys, there's a re-examination now going on in Hollywood of exploitation in all its forms."[22] In fact, the increased scrutiny has spread beyond Singer into his group of homosexual friends:

> The ensuing scandal has prompted a spate of fresh reporting about a party scene involving hordes of barely legal young men and some powerful gay men in Hollywood, reportedly including Singer. According to dispatches by Defamer, Buzzfeed, and others, this party scene has gone on for years. While sexual encounters and relationships between older and younger men are not necessarily illegal, reports of Singer, hosting parties primarily attended by men in their late teens and early 20s has led to accusations the director was exploiting young men who simply wanted to break into the movie business.[23]

Gawker columnist Jordan Sargent also noticed the flood of allegations against Singer:

> [T]he accusation has opened the floodgates of stories, memories, rumors and gossip—much of which landed in our inboxes over the last two days. Welcome to the Bryan Singer sex party mailbag. If there was one sentiment that was consistent across the emails we received about Bryan Singer, it was that "everyone" in Hollywood knew exactly what boys Singer hung out with (young, skinny, and white), what he did with them (gave them cocaine, molly and other drugs at raucous house parties), and why (sex).[24]

The allegations against Singer and his Hollywood peers exposed a correlation between homosexuality and pedophilia. Sargent claimed the scandal could

be a public indictment of Hollywood's gay community: "[Michael] Egan's lawsuits have exposed a culture that was previously visible only to insiders in and around L.A., especially within the gay enclave of West Hollywood." Sargent also indicated that Singer was only one example, but the problem was much larger in scope: "X-Men director Bryan Singer is not the only powerful gay man in Hollywood who likes to surround himself with handsome twinks. But according to a handful of sources who spoke with *Gawker* over the course of the last week, he was known as the most generous and active benefactor of a scene that allowed the young and impressionable to rub up against Hollywood elite—including prominent writers, directors, and actors—leaving behind bitter memories and a sheaf of newly filed lawsuits."[25]

Sargent also examined Hollywood's predatory homosexuality:

> The twink-party scene of which Singer was a fixture is at once troubling and deeply familiar; scandalous and unsurprising. After all, gender aside, the mogul-hosted party filled with willing-to-please ingénues is older even than Hollywood. But, more than anything else, what comes across in conversations with sources is the scene's sadness: another stage on which an aggressive, alienating Hollywood social scene plays itself out. . . . The gates to Singer's mansion are wide open if you're young, cute, and skinny—and if you can't find your way in, there's likely someone out there to pluck you.[26]

Eventually though, most of these young children are given empty promises and discarded after they have been sexually violated:

> "Hollywood is swamped with ambitious young people who will try and use sex to get a sniff of fame and success. But, rarely if ever, does that plan bear fruit. . . . Instead, there seems to be a profound loneliness. Most of the young guys are chewed up and spit out. The ones who become especially close to Singer—trips to Hawaii or the Golden Globes–will eventually be replaced and find themselves with little-to-no legitimate work experience. But the visible ascent of certain young men into the inner circles of people like Singer leads the most impressionable boys into seeing that situation as the jackpot at the end of the rainbow."[27]

Michael Egan, the plaintiff in the lawsuit against Singer, followed along this typical path. According to Daniel Miller of the *LA Times*, "Michael Egan came to Hollywood at 14 or 15, a Nebraska kid who had done some professional modeling and was hoping to make it as an actor." Then, Egan was invited into Hollywood's predatory homosexual community: "A friend at school invited him to a mansion in Encino where, according to a lawsuit filed by Egan, he and other teenage boys were plied with drugs and alcohol—and then coerced into having sex with older men." Egan claimed he was put on a payroll and paid nearly $2,100 a week "in an attempt to manipulate his compliance with the sexual demands of those adults," who attended these homosexual

pedophilia orgies. Ultimately, Egan was sexually exploited but never hired for the movie roles he had anticipated: "Now 31, Egan is unemployed and remains in therapy, according to his attorney, Jeff Herman. A resident of Las Vegas, Egan sought for years to make it in Hollywood as an actor."[28]

While some critics in the media questioned Egan's motives, many supporters acknowledged the validity of his claims:

> The allegations have triggered debates at industry lunch spots and studio back lots throughout Hollywood. To some, the party scene described by Egan has long been an open secret. 'The party culture does exist,' said Anne Henry of BizParentz Foundation, a support group for parents whose children work in the entertainment industry, who was not referring specifically to Egan's allegations. "It is a party culture of older teenage boys."[29]

Bryan Singer is only one example of pedophilia accusations in the entertainment industry. In a deposition for a lawsuit accusing him of homosexual assault, John Travolta testified that he engaged in homosexual acts with Hollywood producers while starring in *Welcome Back, Kotter* in order to advance his career.[30] In 2007, Bryan Burrough of *Vanity Fair* exposed similar allegations against Jewish music executive Lou Pearlman. According to Burrough, Pearlman left America after he was accused of swindling from the investors in his companies and sexually exploiting the young boys in bands he created: "Until he fled the country in January, accused of embezzling more than $300 million, Lou Pearlman was famous as the impresario behind the Backstreet Boys and 'NSync. Turns out his investors weren't the only victims, colleagues reveal: Pearlman's passion for boy bands was also a passion for boys." During a 2006 interview, Justin Timberlake was asked about working for Pearlman and said his band felt like it "was being financially raped by a Svengali." Backstreet Boys member Nick Carter's mother even claimed: "Certain things happened and it almost destroyed our family. I tried to warn everyone. I tried to warn all the mothers . . . I tried to expose him for what he was years ago. . . . I hope you expose him, because the financial is the least of his injustices."[31]

Similarly in 2011, former child star Corey Feldman appeared on ABC *Nightline* and exposed pedophilia in Hollywood. In his book *Coreyography*, Feldman remembered his on-air confession: "'Nobody talks about what the real problem is.' 'What's the real problem?' I could feel it coming, the words bubbling up in my throat. 'The number-one problem in Hollywood,' I said, 'was, and is, and always will be pedophilia. That's the biggest problems in this industry, for children. It's the big secret.'" Later in the book, Feldman wondered: "How does this happen? How do so many innocent, talented, and even famous children wind up suffering in silence? The obvious answer is that pedophiles will flock to an industry where they can surround themselves with eager, ambitious children. But there's another answer too; the bright lights

of Hollywood are blinding, and the sanctity of childhood is easily trumped by the deafening drumbeat of fame."[32] Feldman also remembered the sexual exploitation of his close friend, Corey Haim:

> Within hours of our first meeting, we found ourselves talking about *Lucas*, the film he made in the summer of 1985, the role I had wanted for myself. . . . At some point during the filming, he explained an adult male convinced him that it was perfectly normal for older men and younger boys in the business to have sexual relations, that it was what all 'guys do.' So they walked off to a secluded area between two trailers, during a lunch break for the cast and crew, and Haim, innocent and ambitious as he was, allowed himself to be sodomized.[33]

Although Feldman knew who molested his friend, he refused to disclose the name of the pedophile: "There is nothing I would rather do than publicly out the man who molested—and ultimately destroyed—my dearest friend. Unfortunately, that is not the way the world works. You can't go around publicly accusing industry titans without expecting to find yourself in the middle of a nasty lawsuit, to say nothing of the potential threat to my career, as well as the personal safety of myself and my son."[34] Only years later in 2020 did Feldman identify Charlie Sheen as the molester:

> In his new documentary *(My) Truth: The Rape of Two Coreys*, which debuted on Monday night at a screening in Los Angeles, Feldman listed the men who he says sexually assaulted him and his friend Corey Haim when they were child stars. Among the names, Feldman alleged Haim had said actor Charlie Sheen raped him while making the 1986 film Lucas.[34a]

During the middle of the controversy, the rhetorical fog lifted for a moment, and the iceberg appeared in clear outline when Lena Dunham, the moral voice of her generation, tweeted that "Hollywood shines the light on Catholic Church, sex trafficking. Let's shine it on ourselves and what we've condoned."[35] Since Dunham is Jewish, the "we" here presumably refers to the other Jews in Hollywood and their hatred of the Church.

Then the rest of the fog lifted. In "The Specifically Jewy Perviness of Harvey Weinstein," *Tablet* editor-at-large Mark Oppenheimer wrote that what differentiated Weinstein from men like Roger Ailes, Bill O'Reilly, and Bill Clinton was his identity as a Jew. Weinstein, in Oppenheimer's words, was "a deeply Jewish kind of pervert."[36] "The disgraced film producer," according to Oppenheimer, "is a character straight out of Philip Roth, playing out his revenge fantasies on the *Goyim*":[37]

> Better than perhaps any other author, Roth captured the particular anxiety of the Jewish American man in the twentieth century, finally

> coming into power but, having not grown up with it, unsure of what he's supposed to do now. All those years craving unattainable Gentiles, but never before having the means to entice them. The result is Alexander Portnoy of *Portnoy's Complaint*, a grown man whose emotional and sexual life is still all one big performance piece, just as it had been when he was a teenager and pleasured himself with a piece of liver. . . . As a boy, Portnoy fantasized about attaining a mythical *shiksa* goddess whom he nicknamed The real McCoy. . . . Harvey is cut from the same cloth. Growing up in Queens, he fantasized of fame and fortune, and, once he got them, he struggled to maintain them by building himself into a larger-than-life figure. He yelled at employees like he was a studio boss from the 1920s—the only thing missing was a riding crop. He ran Oscars campaigns like they used to in Old Hollywood. And he harassed women, not necessarily to use them as instruments of his pleasure, but to use them as instruments of his power. . . . It goes without saying that nearly every one of these women—Rose McGowan, Ambra Batillana, Laura Madden, Ashley Judd, etc.—was a Gentile, all the better to feed Weinstein's revenge-tinged fantasy of having risen above his outer-borough, bridge-and-tunnel Semitic origins. But it turns out there was a Jew(ess) in the bunch, none other than Lauren Sivan, of the potted-plant episode. In that small way, he inadvertently broke out of the Portnoy mold, performing his inadequacies not for the great all-American odeon but for a woman who could be his cousin. Harvey can run from who he is, but he can't hide.[38]

As Philip Roth could have explained, there is more than one way to kick an anti-Semite's ass, especially if the ass belongs to the female half of the Gentile race, known in Yiddish as the *shiksa*. The Weinstein story was completely inexplicable without reference to his "specifically Jewy perviness," and understanding that perviness was only possible with the use of the proper vocabulary. Just as Greek philosophy was incomprehensible without an understanding of the word "logos," so Weinstein's degeneracy was incomprehensible without using the word "*shiksa*,"a word which Oppenheimer uses much more sparingly than the Roth he claims to explicate. Something deeper than sexual harassment was going on. Weinstein wasn't an isolated individual; he was a cultural archetype acting out one of the main rituals of Jewish belief: shtupping the *shiksa*. If Weinstein was a "deeply Jewish kind of pervert,"[39] it is impossible to understand this story without using the word "*shiksa*."

In spite of the furor Oppenheimer's article created, he pulled his punches when it came to describing Roth's fiction as the best expression of the Jewish archetype of shtupping the *shiksa*. Portnoy was more than a role model; he was, in the words of Albert Goldman's review of *Portnoy's Complaint* in the

February 7, 1969 edition of *Life Magazine*, "a new American hero," in fact a "messiah." He was:

> A savior and scapegoat of the '60s, [who] is destined at the Christological age of 33 to take upon himself all the sins of sexually obsessed modern man and expiate them in a tragi-comic crucifixion.[40]

Portnoy's task as Jewish Messiah was to liberate the people from the "fascism" of the moral law. That task began with liberating himself, which he did in a peculiarly Jewish way by shtupping *shiksa*s.

As discussed in detail in the chapter eighteen on Portnoy's Complaint in the second volume, the new Jewish savior came, in Portnoy's words, "To save the stupid *shiksa*; to rid her of her race's ignorance; to make this daughter of the heartless oppressor a student of suffering and oppression; to teach her to be compassionate, to bleed a little for the world's sorrows." He did this by giving expression to "the longing in all of us swarthy Jewboys for those bland, blonde exotics called shikses." After all, she "was lusting for our kind no less than we for hers." "Portnoy's lust for shikses," writes Alan Cooper, was "precisely what the traditional anti-Semite said all Jews felt, what the Aryan accused the would-be-defiling Jew of trying to perpetrate."

Marilyn Monroe, the ultimate *shiksa*, was no stranger to the casting couch, admitting to one biographer, that "I've slept with producers. I'd be a liar if I said that I didn't." In 1955, after 20th Century Fox awarded her the richest per-film contract of any actress in Hollywood history, Monroe reportedly said, "It means that I'll never have to suck a Jewish cock again."[41] According to the same author:

> The network of Jewish men that controls Hollywood has always been characterized by an intense sexual fixation on the *shiksa*—*shiksa* being a derogatory slur for a Gentile woman, literally signifying "unclean animal" according to its Yiddish etymology. Hence the ubiquitous "casting couch," a Hollywood institution that provided Jewish powerbrokers access to otherwise unavailable non-Jewish women, whom they despised as non-Jews, yet idealized as avatars of alien sexual desirability. The *shiksa* thus became the ultimate sexual trophy. The Jews who ruled Hollywood, noted Hollywood rabbi Edgar Magnin, "were men who made all that money and realized they were still a bunch of Goddamned Jews. Sleeping with a pretty gentile girl made them feel, if only for a few minutes, 'I'm half gentile.' No wonder they made idols out of *shiksa* goddesses."[42]

Marilyn Monroe was, in the words of one biographer, "virulently anti-Semitic," probably because of what she had to endure on the casting couches of Hollywood's Jewish moguls. At least the Jewish moguls were satisfied in controlling Monroe's body, unlike the Jewish doctors who took control of her mind through drugs and the Jewish science of psychoanalysis. After Monroe tried to free herself from the control of Ralph Greenson, her Jewish

psychoanalyst, Greenson killed her by having a female employee "administer. . . a fatal barbiturate-laced enema."[43]

MARILYN MONROE AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

Marilyn Monroe was introduced to psychoanalysis by Lee Strasberg, the influential creator of "method acting," which spawned Marlon Brando and James Dean. Brando referred to his first Jewish analyst, Beta Mittelman, as "the coldest man I've ever known" and regretted the fact that he spent thousands of dollars on psychoanalysts who "did nothing but convince me that most New York and Beverly Hills psychoanalysts are a little crazy themselves, as well as highly motivated to separate patients from their money while making their emotional problems worse."[44]

Portnoy's Complaint, we need to remember, is a monologue delivered from a psychiatrist's couch. Portnoy, like Harvey Weinstein, is a Jew whose main happiness consists in debunking the beliefs of the *goyim* (in Weinstein's case, through the movies he produced) while defiling their women, something Portnoy did while on a congessional committee in Washington.

When Irving Howe complained in the December 1972 issue of *Commentary* about the bad effect that *Portnoy's Complaint* was having on younger Jews, "who have taken the book as a signal for 'letting go' of both their past and perhaps themselves, a guide to swinging in good conscience or better yet without troubling about conscience," it is difficult not to think of Harvey Weinstein, who in one of his early exculpatory press releases blamed being raised during the '60s and '70s as the source of his moral depravity. The folks at *Commentary* were embarrassed by the frankness with which Roth expressed Jewish hatred for the *goyim* which most Jews would only express when the *goyim* were not within earshot. In other words, shtupping shikas doesn't make the Jews at *Commentary* as uncomfortable as talking about it in public does.

Roth's hatred of the *goyim* is so virulent that even child molestation is permitted: during the course of Roth's novel *My Life as a Man*, the Roth character has an affair with his wife's daughter.

When his relationship with his *shiksa* wife goes sour, the Roth character's relatives tell him that he has only himself to blame for his misfortune, and the Roth character concludes that he "made the grotesque mistake of elevating" his wife "to the status of a human being toward whom I had moral responsibility."

Harvey Weinstein is much closer to Mickey Sabbath, age 64, the hero of Roth's novel *Sabbath's Theater*. Sabbath is Portnoy 30 years later. In his "salad days," as Roth would say, Sabbath ran the Indecent Theater of Manhattan "where the atmosphere was insinuatingly anti-moral, vaguely menacing and, at the same time, rascally fun," which sounds a lot like the Harvey Weinstein production company, except for the fun part. Sabbatha is a puppeteer because

a puppeteer is "a lover and master of guile, artifice, and the unreal." Sabbath's main talent, however, is his ability to corrupt the morals of dumb shikses, as shown by a tape of his telephone sex with an undergraduate which got broadcast over the university's counseling hotline. "There was in these tapes," Roth tells us, in a way that explains the similarities between Sabbath and Harvey Weinstein:

> a kind of art in the way he was able to unshackle his girls from the habit of their innocence. There was a kind of art in his providing an illicit adventure not with a boy of their own age but with someone three times their age—the very repugnance that his aging body inspired in him had to make their adventure with him a little like a crime and thereby give free play to their budding perversity and to the confused exhilaration that comes with flirting disgrace. . . . Once he passed into his fifties, the art in these tapes – the insidious art of giving license to what was already there was the only art he had left.

We have here the deepest expression of Roth's fantasy life and, by extension, the fantasy lives of all of the Hollywood moguls who served as the model for Roth's Jewish archetype. Their fantasy consists in this: the *goyim* in the end will thank their Mock Messiah for the role he played in corrupting their morals. Weinstein will hate the *goyim*; he will kick the anti-Semites in the ass; he will shtupp every *shiksa* he can lay his hands on, and the *goyim* will be grateful for his hatred. The fact that Jews like Roth and Weinstein have been praised so fulsomely by the culture they hated and hoped to destroy shows that their fantasy was not all that removed from reality.

"SCUM OF THE EARTH"

The only *goy* who ever understood this was Joe Breen, the Catholic who created the Legion of Decency and was the first enforcer of the Hollywood Production Code. Grassroots protest against Hollywood's sexualization of the culture increased throughout the 1920s to the point where numerous state legislatures were preparing to take legal action, establishing their own censorship boards. The Catholics prevented that from happening by establishing the national Legion of Decency and effectively bringing Hollywood to bay through the threat of economic boycott. Eventually, Joseph I. Breen was appointed the Catholic censor to Hollywood. Breen was no nativist. The fact that he held his job for 20 years and was given an award by the people he censored when he retired showed, as Mark Viera points out in his book on pre-Code Hollywood that he was no anti-Semite. But Breen saw the battle over the sexualization of American culture in essentially ethnic terms. "Ninety-five percent of these folks," he wrote describing the Hollywood moguls of the 1930s, "are Jews of an Eastern European lineage. They are, probably, the scum of the earth. . . . These Jews seem to think of nothing but money making and sexual indulgence."[45]

The only thing that has changed is the position of the Catholic Church, which ran up the white flag of surrender in 1965 when the hierarchy abandoned the Legion of Decency and now considers the Jews who produce one anti-Catholic film after another their elder brothers in the faith. Once the Catholics lost their nerve in the war over the sexualization of culture, once they backed away from holding Hollywood to the basic rudiments of sexual decency, it was inevitable that the instruments of culture they failed to control would get used against them in all out cultural warfare.

Don't expect the Catholics to resurrect the Legion of Decency any time soon. But don't expect God to sit this one out either. The Hollywood of Harvey Weinstein is dying every bit as much as the studio system which preceded it died in the '60s. It looks as if it is going to perish of its own wretched excess:

> By the time Labor Day weekend wraps, summer box-office revenue in North America will end up being down nearly 16 percent over last year, the steepest decline in modern times and eclipsing the 14.6 percent dip in 2014. It will also be the first time since 2006 that summer didn't clear $4 billion. . . . Attendance also plummeted, and is almost assured of hitting a 25-year low in terms of the number of tickets sold, according to Box Office Mojo.[46]

Hollywood is being replaced by Internet streaming and outlets like Netflix or cable channels like Home Box Office, which are no improvement. The more things change the more they remain the same. Joe Breen is still right; nothing has changed. The Jews who run Hollywood are still "the scum of the earth," and, more importantly, they still "decide what the film fare of the nation is supposed to be." Then as now the Jews will be as pervy as the Catholics let them be. This lack of change extends to the Jews themselves, who continue to rage against logos and get angry at anyone who objects to their destructive rage. The Simon Wiesenthal Center didn't rescind its humanitarian of the year award because by shtupping all those *shiksas*, Harvey Weinstein was simply being a good Jew. Hatred, as Rabbi Meir Soloveichik reminded us in *First Things*, is a Jewish virtue. Philip Roth was able to formulate archetypes like Alex Portnoy and Mickey Sabbath because he had met Jews like them so frequently in real life. All Weinstein was doing was giving sexual expression to his hatred of the *goyim* by defiling their women. The fact that he was singled out as Hollywood's scapegoat indicates nothing more than Hollywood's attempt to continue its wretched existence at his expense because, then as now, it is better that one man die than that the people perish.

Chapter Eighteen

Catholics And the Jew Taboo

In December 2014, Archbishop Charles Chaput, ordinary of the Archdiocese of Philadelphia, gave a speech under the auspices of the neoconservative flag ship magazine *First Things* on how Catholics had become "strangers in a strange land." Chaput referred to Catholics as "people who uphold a traditional moral architecture for sexuality, marriage, and family" and complained that "in the space of just 20 years" their beliefs had been transformed "from mainstream conviction to the equivalent of racists and bigots."[1] More seriously, the Church was failing to pass the faith on to the next generation.

This was an especially bitter pill for American bishops because over the course of the last century they had become Americanists to a man. Beginning with the Cardinal Spellman generation, the American hierarchy allowed itself to get sucked into the anti-Communist crusade at the same time that the Deep State of that day, under the direction of psychological warriors like Louis Wirth of the University of Chicago, was destroying Catholic parishes in every large city of the North. Before they ever discovered who had betrayed them in their own cities, the Bernardin generation of bishops became proxy warriors for the next black op, which came to be known as the sexual revolution. Finally, a new generation of bishops arose in reaction to the Bernardin generation of bishops, and they fell for another black op known as neoconservativism.

During the course of his talk it became clear that Archbishop Chaput is a neoconservative who believes in American Exceptionalism. It's no coincidence that Chaput gave the talk under the auspices of *First Things*, whose mission he describes as "to advance a religiously informed public policy for the ordering of society." Chaput interprets this mind-numbing mission statement platitude as "another way of saying that there's some good in the world, and it's worth fighting for. That mission, which all of us in some way share, bears the best fruit when we understand that the purpose of our lives isn't politics."

Noble thoughts those, but if there were one man who felt that the purpose of life was politics, or more specifically political infighting among conservative

groups, it was Richard John Neuhaus, the founder of *First Things*. In response to a request from a bewildered new convert to Catholicism, I wrote the following note, explaining that:

> *First Things* was founded by Richard John Neuhaus, a Lutheran pastor who later became a Catholic priest, with money which he stole from The Rockford Institute, the premier paleoconservative think tank at the time. Paleoconservativism was headquartered in the Mid-West, where I live. Its champion at the time was Pat Buchanan, who ran for president in 1992 and 1996 by resurrecting Lindbergh's America First movement. Neuhaus was head of their Religion and Society Report, but he lived in New York, where he made contact with Midge Decter and Norman Podhoretz, the power couple of neoconservatism, who helped Neuhaus steal the $250,000 grant from the Bradley Foundation.

If you need more proof of Chaput's neocon *bona fides*, I recommend George Weigel's article in *National Review*, praising him as:

> a stalwart, courageous, and unflinching reformer of the Church in the three dioceses he has served, where he has made clear that, as John Paul II said to the U.S. cardinals in 2002, "there is no room" in the clergy "for those who would abuse the young"; that he is widely respected by his peers in the American hierarchy as one of the best bishops of his generation; and that he has saved the Archdiocese of Philadelphia from utter financial—and thus evangelical—catastrophe by dint of performing wonders since his arrival in Philadelphia in 2011. No other bishop envies him the job he took on then; more than one American bishop believes that he is the only one of their number who could have pulled it off in Philadelphia, in terms of both the Church's public credibility and the stabilization of its finances.[2]

What Weigel meant to say is that Chaput's ruthless liquidation of Church assets that took generations to acquire has earned him the reputation of being the Chainsaw Al of the American hierarchy. The former head of his seminary in Denver called him a "serial killer," for his ruthless firing of diocesan employees there before coming to Philadelphia.[3] Of course, in neoconservative circles this sort of pathology merits praise from people like George Weigel. I can't think of anything more damning for a bishop than being praised by George Weigel. No, wait, yes I can, being praised by Robert Sirico. No other kind of bishop would associate with *First Things*, which is itself a black op.

The crucial issue at the time Chaput gave his talk at *First Things* was gay marriage, which, he says, had created "a tipping point in American public discourse" and has brought about "the silencing of any privileged voice that biblical belief once had in our public square."[4] The debate surrounding gay marriage has brought about "the destruction of public reason" and hatred for anyone espousing traditional morality.

Chaput blamed gay marriage on secularism. He knows this because he read a book on the secular revolution that took place in America between 1870 and 1930 which was edited by Christian Smith, who claimed that:

> The secular team won, the religious team lost. There was nothing accidental or inevitable about the outcome. In the words of Smith, it was "an intentional political struggle by secularizing activists to overthrow a religious establishment's control over socially legitimate knowledge."[5]

Six months after he gave his talk, Chaput's worst nightmare came true. On June 26, 2015, the Supreme Court handed down its *Obergefell v. Hodges* decision legalizing gay marriage. The only consolation that Chaput could derive from this catastrophe was a clear understanding of what had happened: "secularizing activists" had taken control of the America Chaput loved.

Have you ever met a "secularizing activist"? Can you look them up in the phone book? Does anyone know what a phone book is? "Secularizing activist" sounds like a euphemism to me, but this assumes conscious dissimulation on Smith's part, which may not be the case. More plausible is the idea that "secularizing activist" is a fiction in the mind of academics like Christian Smith, who are paid to keep young people docile by getting them into debt with student loans and filling their heads with bad ideas. That is the purpose of higher education. It is a form of social engineering. Part of the job of social engineering entails an obfuscation of the real players in American history.

In what we used to call "the real world" when I was an academic, people had real identities associated with real groups. You could look up both in the phone book. One of those real people in the real world is Amy Dean. Is Amy Dean a "secularizing activist"? I don't know. I do know that she is a Jew, and I also know that she said that Jews were responsible for gay marriage. In an article she wrote for *Tikkun* magazine, Dean claimed that:

> In a few short years, same-sex marriage went from being an untouchable political hot potato to a broadly accepted civil right in eighteen states and the District of Columbia. Jews, and their social justice organizations, helped make that happen. In fact, this magazine was a prophetic voice of marriage equality, supporting same-sex unions in the early 1990s and helping to lay the groundwork for the current wave of victories.[6]

Dean cites another Jewish thinker's claim that

> it is no accident that Jews embraced same-sex marriage. "As the narrative on marriage equality in the country has moved," he says, "Jews—as people who value equality, value civil rights, and have a long historical understanding of what it means to be discriminated against—are consistently at the front of that."

"Secularizing activist," it turns out, is a code word for Jew. Dean goes on to say that, "The campaign for marriage equality offers valuable lessons for

how to break through public resistance on other issues that Jewish groups are now addressing." And indeed it does, but only if we are willing to hold Jews responsible for what they brag about in their own magazines. It also explains how Jews broke through public resistance in the past on issues ranging from school prayer to pornography to abortion to homosexuality. It explains things so well that it is impossible to understand the Catholic Church's failure in the culture wars without explaining its enemies on the other side of the culture wars, namely the Jews. This is precisely the problem.

FIRST THINGS FIRST

Archbishop Chaput's association with *First Things* and neoconservatism may also explain why he was reluctant to get specific about the real identity of Smith's "secularizing activists," because, as I pointed out to the already mentioned recent convert: "The Jews created *First Things* using Neuhaus as their puppet. Evidently, Archbishop Chaput doesn't know this, or if he knows, he isn't saying. He also evidently doesn't know that the Jews gave us gay marriage, as Amy Dean makes clear in her article in *Tikkun* magazine. Chaput has been crippled by his adoption of Catholic neoconservatism and is symptomatic of the problem. He is still an Americanist and doesn't even know it."

Praising Chaput in the wake of *Obergefell*, George Weigel had strong words for those who feel that they can go along with American culture in its present form:

> The useful idiots who insist that, if the bishops of the United States would just retreat from the culture wars, all would be well, are manifesting their ignorance of the requirements of pastoral leadership while unwittingly confessing to a degree of political stupidity that is staggering. *Obergefell* has let loose demons, and their name is Legion. Those demons should be fought with compassion, critical intelligence, and blunt honesty about the Church's own failings. They should be fought with hearts open to the possibility of conversion on the part of even the most besotted Church-bashers. And they should be fought in full recognition that we all live by the Divine Mercy.
>
> But they must be fought. Both the Church's evangelical witness and the future of the American democratic experiment depend on it.[7]

Weigel thumps his chest here with no admission that the neocons did do battle and lost. In this he differs from Amy Dean, who brings up the ill-fated Manhattan Declaration, which was supposed to put an end gay marriage in 2009. In that year, according to Dean,

> large religious organizations such as the Roman Catholic Church, the Southern Baptist Convention and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-

> Day Saints (Mormon Church) arrayed themselves against it; leaders from these and other Christian groups signed a document that year called the Manhattan Declaration, that which [*sic*] claimed the Bible prohibits same-sex unions. (Over half a million people have since signed the Manhattan Declaration, although many others say it misinterprets Biblical teachings.)

The Manhattan Declaration was the brainchild of Robert George, head of the Witherspoon Institute at Princeton University. Archbishop Chaput signed the Manhattan Declaration along with a number of other Catholic bishops. Their bright idea at the time was "religious liberty." That idea has failed. *Obergefell* was the final nail in the religious liberty coffin. The bishops barely mention religious liberty anymore because Trump has let them off the hook that Obama had placed them on by insisting that they pay for contraception and abortion as part of Obama care. The bishops tried to enlist Jewish support in this religious liberty campaign, but the Jews, in spite of being the Catholics' elder brothers in the faith, turned the Catholics down cold. The failure of the religious liberty ploy with the Jews left Chaput and the Catholic neocon brain trust without a clue about how to proceed.

Maybe it's time that the Catholic bishops stopped listening to George Weigel and Robbie George and started listening to people like Amy Dean, because she at least has a clear understanding of what happened. It wasn't "secularizing activists" who gave us gay marriage; it was the Jews. As Amy Dean says:

> The victories in the states around marriage equality owed much to local and national Jewish social justice groups who looked beyond the political consensus of the time. Even five years ago, many of these groups stood behind same-sex couples who wished to marry. National Jewish social justice organizations . . . helped to galvanize the American Jewish community to support pro-marriage equality bills in the states. In fact, Jews can claim a fair share of the credit for bringing Americans to a tipping point of accepting marriage equality.

Unlike Christian Smith and Archbishop Chaput, Amy Dean is willing to name names. One of the main players in the Jews' campaign to undermine the institution of marriage was Rabbi David Saperstein, who in 2007, wrote in an op-ed in the *Washington Post*:

> We have reached a point in American society where the obvious is clear: neither my marriage nor anyone else's is threatened by two loving individuals of the same sex. And it is increasingly difficult for religious leaders to envision that the loving God of the Universe does not welcome such faithful relationships.[8]

Unlike Archbishop Chaput, who was on the wrong side of history at the time, Rabbi Saperstein was presumably on good terms with "the loving God of the universe," who had evidently changed his mind since he wrote all of those nasty, homophobic things about sodomy in the Pentateuch. Something else that may have helped the cause along is the fact that Rabbi Saperstein's wife, Ellen Weiss, was in charge of the news room at National Public Radio during the entire campaign for gay marriage. During the run up to *Obergefell*, they both used the news room at NPR as the propaganda ministry for the gay marriage movement.

In addition to controlling the media, the Jews out-organized the Catholics on a grassroots level. According to Dean,

> Jewish activists and leaders at both the national and local/regional levels spearheaded the recent wave of victories for marriage equality (such as state-by-state legalizing of same-sex marriage and the defeat of the Defense of Marriage Act). "We did it in a variety of smaller ways," says Susskind. "[We had to] get rabbis signed on, get other community leaders signed on, do calling drives, get people engaged with their state legislators." Susskind cites the work of regional Jewish groups as key to winning in several states; these include Jewish Community Action (JCA) in Minnesota, Jews United for Justice in Maryland, and Bend the Arc's regional offices in Los Angeles and the Bay Area in California.
>
> State Senator Scott Dibble of Minnesota said the work of JCA was "very important" in two major recent fights there: defeating a 2012 amendment to the state's constitution that would have banned same-sex marriage, and the subsequent passage of a state law that legalized it. "They provided lots of organizational support." Dibble said. "The support came in many forms, a lot of it very practical and tangible. JCA arranged for meeting space in several different synagogues as we were getting underway." Beyond providing such material assistance, Dibble said JCA was "also just a real key force and driver in the aspect of the campaign that relied on bringing the faith voice to the forefront."

More important than their ability to organize, the Jews were able to win the gay marriage battle because they were able to identify the enemy in a way that their Catholic opponents in the culture wars were not.

IDENTIFY THE ENEMY

Instead of reading *First Things*, Archbishop Chaput should have been reading Sun Tzu's book *The Art of War*, where he would have learned that:

> If you know the enemy and know yourself, you need not fear the result of a hundred battles. If you know yourself but not the enemy, for every

> victory gained you will also suffer a defeat. If you know neither the enemy nor yourself, you will succumb in every battle.

Catholics have been losing the culture wars for more than 50 years because Catholics can't identify the enemy, and they can't identify the enemy because they can't say the word "Jew." What happened to cause this problem? The Second Vatican Council ended in the same year, 1965, in which Hollywood Jews broke the Motion Picture Production Code which had kept them in line for the previous 31 years. The Catholics succeeded in preserving common decency and the moral order because Joe Breen, who became the head of the Production Code in 1933, knew how to say the word Jew. "These people are eastern European Jews," he wrote to the American bishops. "They are the scum of the earth. The entire film production of the US should not be left in their hands."

One defeat after another followed the Catholic capitulation to the Jews in Hollywood. The Supreme Court handed down *Griswold vs. Connecticut*, the decision decriminalizing the sale of contraceptives, in the same year the Jews broke the Production Code. Contraception was a WASP crusade, but it led to *Roe v. Wade*, the decision which decriminalized abortion. Abortion, as Bernard Nathanson pointed out, was the Jewish crusade *par excellence*.[9] The Jews' success in de-criminalizing abortion led inexorably to *Obergefell*.

Catholics have lost every single battle in the culture wars because they cannot bring themselves to say the word Jew. Because they cannot say the word Jew, they cannot identify the enemy. Am I saying that the Jews are our enemy? Yes, the Jews are the people who killed Christ. They are enemies of the entire human race. This is not my idea. St. Paul said it in I Thessalonians 2. The battle that the Jews won 50 years ago in the public square is now being fought in the sanctuary of every Catholic Church during Holy Week. At the Stations of the Cross held during Lent at the Basilica of the Sacred Heart on the campus of the University of Notre Dame, Catholics were told that "Nicodemus visited Jesus by night out of fear of the Temple Authorities," in a passage which deliberately censored the Gospel of St. John, which referred to "fear of the Jews." The word "Jew" appears 71 times in the Gospel of St. John but nowhere in the Stations of the Cross held at Notre Dame.

The Jews have no such qualms. In her *Tikkun* article, Amy Dean clearly defined the enemy as the Manhattan Declaration, Robbie George, and the Catholic Church in ascending order of importance. Catholics like Archbishop Chaput lost the gay marriage battle because they identified the enemy as "secularizing activists" and not as Jews. Catholics are not allowed to talk about Jews. They are most certainly not allowed to criticize Jews. Clerics like Chaput base this taboo on *Nostra Aetate* and think that they are implementing Vatican II when they capitulate to the cultural taboo which has been known

since the time of Christ as "fear of the Jews." Fear of the Jews is especially virulent in our day. It is a function of Jewish political power.

But there is some indication that things are changing. On January 15, 2018, Charles Bausman published an article on *Russia Insider* entitled "It's Time to Drop the Jew Taboo," claiming that the Jew Taboo was "making serious discussion of Russian geopolitics and history next to impossible."[10] The Jew Taboo has become so strict that "One cannot even criticize a small subsection of Jews, a miniscule percentage of the Jewish population, even when they richly deserve it." What was once a Catholic problem has now taken on geopolitical ramifications. Bausman, the Editor-in-Chief of *Russia Insider*, wrote the article because he is

> convinced that unless we break this taboo, nothing will improve in the human catastrophe unfolding in geopolitics. Millions have died over the past 30 years, and if we want it to stop that trend and avoid a cataclysm which seems to be approaching inexorably, we have to have the freedom to criticize those responsible. It is very clear to me, as it is to many others, that much of the guilt for this comes from Jewish pressure groups, particularly in the media.[11]

The main manifestation of the Jew Taboo in our day is the use of euphemisms like "secularizing activists," or "Anglozionists," or "globalists." As Israel Shamir pointed out, Anne Coulter brought humor to the discussion of the Jew Taboo when she tweeted that "Paul Newman is only half globalist" and "Israel is the last refuge of globalists."[12]

The use of euphemisms makes an accurate understanding of the current global situation impossible. It is impossible to understand the current wave of Russophobia sweeping the West or the demonization of Vladimir Putin without discussing Jews and their ancestral, centuries-long animosity toward Russia because, Bausman writes, "Jewish is the only term that accurately describes it."

Neoconservatism, "Russia's harshest foe," is Jewish. American foreign policy after the fall of Communism is incomprehensible if that fact is suppressed because

> their trouble-making extends far beyond Russia—they are responsible for America's disastrous debacle in the Middle East over the last 20 years—where their crimes have been stymied by precisely one country—Russia. The psychotically anti-Russian recent UN ambassadors, Nikki Haley and Samantha Power, were put there by the Israel lobby, and given an independent brief, in other words, they answer not to their presidents, rather to their Jewish sponsors.[13]

The Jew Taboo is imposed on us by the mainstream media, which are controlled by Jews:

> At the two leading newspapers of the land, the *New York Times* and *The Washington Post*, both very Jewish in ownership, editors, and staff, have been waging an all-out jihad against Putin's Russia, and are guilty of the most grotesque dishonesty, slander and journalistic malpractice – exhaustively catalogued by one of the most authoritative and admired veteran journalists in America, Robert Parry, winner of the Polk award, among other accolades. You can see an archive of his extraordinary work criticizing these two publications, particularly in relation to Russia [on line]. Trump and his supporters are up in arms about these two papers' serial mendacity about him both before and after his election – well they have been doing the same with Putin and Russia for a good 18 years now, and gone much further in their dishonesty, hard as that might be to believe.
>
> . . . *The New Republic*, *Newsweek*, *The Atlantic*, and the Rothschild-owned *Economist* pump out story after story full of what can only be called lies, in a massive campaign to demonize Russia and Putin.[14]

All of this has been accomplished in the complete absence of legal threat. The Jew Taboo is a taboo in the truest sense of the word. It works because people internalize it. Bausman is an American, and as a result, he will

> not be clapped into prison for publishing this article, but the taboo works like a charm to keep the topic out of public discussion. Who needs repressive laws when you can con people into censoring themselves? In Germany, the dominant power in Europe, and in other European countries, I could be locked up for it – another shocking thought, for this son of Germany.[15]

Bausman failed to mention England, where Jez Turner, head of the London Forum, faced a jail term for criticizing London's extralegal Jewish police force. Not content with small fish like Jez Turner, the Jews orchestrated a showdown with the head of the Labour Party, Jeremy Corbyn, over what the *Jewish Chronicle* termed an "obviously anti-Semitic" mural depicting "a group of businessmen and bankers sitting around a monopoly style board and counting money."[16] The reporter who claimed that the mural was "obviously anti-Semitic," failed to mention that the artist depicted Rothschilds, who were Jews, and Rockefellers, who were not. None of this mattered because by the time England's Jews decided to topple Corbyn, banker had become an inadmissible slur not because of the usury bankers practiced but because it had become a code word for Jew, at least in their eyes.

TIKKUN OLAM

Writing for the *Unz Review* in late March 2018, Israel Shamir claimed that "speaking about the Jews is fraught with consequences,"[17] all of which are unpleasant. The phenomenon is not new. Even a man with the political clout of Shamir's hero Josef Stalin capitulated to the Jew Taboo by using the term "rootless cosmopolitans." At the other end of the political spectrum in Stalin's day, Joe McCarthy referred to Jews as communists. Because of compliance with the Jew Taboo for the past half century, the ban has extended to terms which the politically correct see as code words for Jews. Referring to the Talmudic tradition of building a hedge or fence around the Torah, Jews have created "a new fence." Any reference to "bankers," "moneylenders," and even "globalists" now falls under the Jew Taboo because according to the Talmudic logic behind it, "if you call George Soros a 'globalist' today," you might call a Jew a Jew tomorrow.[18]

As a result "there is a permanent demand for euphemisms" like "secularizing activists."[19] The Russians are now being subjected to linguistic programming through media like Facebook, whose likes and dislikes along with the threat of being "unfriended"

> go a long way to bring Jewish hegemony to Russia. Beside protecting Jews, or Blacks from micro-insults, the banning of words has a powerful impact on the mind. Whoever tells you what you may or may not say, is a person of authority. This way of subduing people to your command is called Neuro-Linguistic Programming (NLP), and the CIA is on the forefront of using this black magic of words.[20]

What is true of Russia is *a fortiori* true of America's culture wars. The Catholics lost all of those battles because they couldn't fight back, and they couldn't fight back because they couldn't identify who was attacking them and everything they held sacred. The Jews defeated the Catholics in the gay marriage battle, according to Dean, because the Jews had "a clear moral position rooted in religious values." It was "Jewish leaders" who "helped reassure voters who may have been unsure about the religious implications of voting for marriage equality."[21] Her position is what Nietzsche would term "*die Umwertung aller Werte*" or the transvaluation of all values. The Jewish rebellion against logos insures that what used to be bad, i.e., sodomy, is now good. What used to be good, opposition to sodomy, is now bad. The Jews refer to this form of moral subversion as *Tikkun Olam*, or healing the world. The result is inevitably some heaven on earth like the one Bolsheviks created in the Soviet Union, which leads to untold suffering before it collapses in a cloud of disillusionment and the Jews move on to their next messianic movement.

Tikkun Olam is the Jews' term for what I call the Jewish revolutionary spirit. *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* bespeaks my attempt to break the Jew Taboo and resituate discussion of the Jewish question where it belongs, which

is to say, as a theological rather than a racial issue. The Jewish revolutionary spirit began at the foot of the cross. When the Jews rejected Christ, they rejected the Logos Incarnate, and when they rejected Logos, they became revolutionaries, which is what they have remained to this day.

I made that claim in an article which appeared after I had been banned from speaking on the campus of The Catholic University of America, where I learned that the Jew Taboo is enforced by Catholics on other Catholics. In February 2008 an entire lecture series on "Building Catholic Communities" was cancelled at The Catholic University of America after the dean of the school of architecture received a call from Mark Potok of the Southern Poverty Law Center. "We were surprised," Potok wrote, "that Catholic University was allowing two raging anti-Semites on their campus." The two raging anti-Semites in question were E. Michael Jones and John Sharpe, president of IHS press. "These are not the Latin Mass traditionalists," Mr. Potok continued. "These are the people who reject Vatican II reforms. They are out of [actor Mel Gibson's father] Hutton Gibson's world, in saying that the Jews are destroying the world."

Needless to say, no one from Catholic University called me to ask if I held the views Potok ascribed to me. Instead, the entire lecture series got cancelled. That meant that nine other speakers, none of whom knew me or espoused my views were denied the ability to speak because of Potok's baseless accusations. Eventually the university issued a statement, which appeared in the *Washington Times*, claiming that an entire semester's group of speakers "appear to espouse views that are contrary to the mission and values of Catholic University. In the light of this development, the dean of the school decided to cancel the lecture series."[22]

Of course, the dean had no idea what my views were since he never bothered to contact me. The fact that he would cancel other speakers simply because of their association with my unknown views is breathtaking in either its stupidity or its cowardice. Either way, the dean's actions reminded me of "Nazis lining everyone in the village up against the wall and shooting them because they were suspected of harboring partisans."[23] The dean did this to fellow Catholics who were never given the chance to defend themselves against a Jew who accused them of anti-Semitism simply because they spoke at the same lecture series at which I was scheduled to speak, proving that Catholics feel that they have to be more zealous in enforcing Jewish taboos than the Jews themselves.

I eventually got to make a statement to *The Washington Times* pointing out the ironies of my situation: "We were Catholics talking to other Catholics about Catholic Community. The SPLC has veto power over what Catholics can say to each other, all because of the cowards at Catholic University," who didn't show me "the courtesy of calling me up" and asking me what my views were.[24]

Potok's real beef was with my book *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit* (first edition). But if he had mentioned a book, someone might have read it, so "dynamic silence" reigned over the real cause of the cancelation, and two deans at the university banned a Catholic from speaking at Catholic University for articulating the Catholic position in a book which did not figure in the conference that got canceled. The deans, moreover, banned nine other speakers whose views on the topic remain unknown to this day. They also banned a discussion of my book relevant to the topic of Catholic communities, *The Slaughter of Cities*, which is about urban renewal as a form of ethnic cleaning and had nothing whatsoever to do with Jews. All in all it was an impressive performance.

Four months earlier, Dean Nakas had allowed Senator John Kerry to speak in direct violation of the bishops' guidelines at The Catholic University of America, which specified that it should refuse a platform to speakers' who espoused "positions that are at variance with the fundamental moral teachings of the Catholic Church," as Kerry's position on abortion was. Nakas allowed Kerry to speak because he was not planning to speak about abortion. But he did not allow me to speak even though what I intended to say did not contradict Church teaching and had nothing to do with the objections Potok raised.

The simple accusation of anti-Semitism was enough to send the entire university into panic mode. So powerful was this taboo twelve years ago. As I said then, "any sense of principle or due process goes out the window the moment that anyone raises the issue of anti-Semitism."[25] The SPLC wields the charge of anti-Semitism, knowing full well that "the ultimate taboo" is the simplest way of "silencing the people they want silenced."[26]

My experience in Prague was depressingly similar. I had given a talk on the Gospel of St. John, which was based on the first chapter of *The Jewish Revolutionary Spirit*. One week later, my name appeared in the headline of the one of the local dailies shouting: "Jones says Jews are Children of Satan." Instead of laughing at the obvious reference to the Gospel of St. John, where Jesus Christ made this claim, Cardinal Miloslav Vlk, the local ordinary, denounced me as an anti-Semite to both the American and Israeli embassies. What he had in mind is not completely clear. Discussing the Gospel of St. John does not constitute criminal activity in the United States, and was not going to revoke my passport because of the cardinal's report, and I had then and still have no desire to go to Israel. So what was the point of this gratuitous act? Was it to curry favor with the Jews, who have always been and remain to this day a power in Prague? Vlk had already apologized for the famous crucifix and Calvary monument on the Charles Bridge after Ronald Brown, an American Rabbi from Temple Beth Am in Merrick, New York informed the mayor of Prague that he was offended by the idea that the Church would

punish a Jew for blasphemy. The mayor then contacted Cardinal Vlk, who promptly capitulated to the Jew Taboo.[27]

Just in case you're wondering, this story does not have a sad ending—not for me, at least. Confronted with the despair of one of the pillars of traditional Catholicism in Argentina, narrated to me when I was there, all I could think of was the story of what happened in Poland after the publication of the Polish translation of my book *Libido Dominandi*. A few days before my arrival at the estancia in Entre Rios, I got an e-mail from a man in Poland who said that between *Libido Dominandi* being published there and the Polish bishops' pastoral letter, gender ideology had been obliterated in Poland. No one took the push for gay marriage or gender equality or homosexual rights seriously any more (other than those who were paid to promote them) because they had all been exposed as instruments of control, exercised by covert alien elements like the George Soros foundations, to enslave the Polish people.

The victory in Poland came down to the moment in the car when the publisher and the editors and I were heading toward the first talk, the one that was going to be held at the Cathedral in Warsaw. The publisher's cell phone was ringing every two minutes to announce new and more formidable demonstrations against me because I was an anti-Semite. We will never know for sure, but I suspect that if the Polish bishops had caved in at that point and thrown me under the bus, we would not have won this battle in the culture wars in Poland. What I said then deserves repeating because it applies *a fortiori* to the current situation in the United States: the Church can have either unity or good relations with the Jews, but she can't have both. Bishops who espouse Jewish ideologies like neoconservatism ensure the continued hegemony of the Jew Taboo. Because the Church now enjoys good relations with the Jews, it has no unity; and, because it has no unity, it continues to lose the culture wars.

In 2008 the most famous member of Catholic University's architecture department was not the dean; it was an undergraduate by the name of Antonella Barba. Barba reached the apogee of her 15 minutes of fame when she got voted off *American Idol* on March 8, 2007. Barba had already become famous on the Catholic University campus for posing naked in front of various monuments in Washington. Instead of punishing her, the same authorities who banned me from speaking encouraged Catholic University students to "show their support for Barba on the website antonella-barba.org—one of the three Internet sites that have already cropped up to keep tabs on Barba's trek toward singer-stardom."[28]

The Internet would play an unexpected role in derailing "Barba's trek toward singer-stardom" when photos of her performing fellatio showed up on it. The release of Barba's sex photos probably ended her run at *American Idol*, but it led to lucrative offers from pornographers and a career that went nowhere. In response to a Google search on "Whatever happened to Antonella Barba?" I

learned that "there hasn't been any news on her because she's returned to her hometown and her regular life. She may pop back up in the media soon, but I doubt it, unless she takes that Playboy model offer." There is no indication that she is putting the undergraduate degree she earned in architecture the same year that that department banned me from campus to any use or that the teachers she had at Catholic University did anything to warn her about the devil's empty promises. As a result, she will remain immortalized in her online sex videos.

Rev. David M. O'Connell, president of The Catholic University of America in 2008, suffered a similar fate. He didn't get voted off *American Idol*, but he didn't get the job he wanted either. At the time of my talk, he announced in the Catholic University student newspaper that he was about to be appointed ordinary of the Fort Wayne-South Bend diocese. It was a consummation devoutly to be wished. O'Connell despised Notre Dame, and for that reason alone would have made a good bishop. If God had asked me then, I would have pleaded with Him to appoint O'Connell bishop of the Fort Wayne-South Bend diocese, but God had other plans. O'Connell's plans for reforming Notre Dame never got carried out because he never got the job. Eventually, like Barba, he got a consolation prize of sorts when he was appointed ordinary of the Diocese of Trenton in December 2010. Amateur Vaticanologists at the time claimed that O'Connell didn't get a red hat in South Bend because his eagerness to make life difficult for Notre Dame led to his premature announcement. I know better. He didn't get it because he failed the shepherd test when he threw me under the bus. What goes around comes around. Whether the Jew Taboo still rules The Catholic University of America is anyone's guess. Shamir concludes his article by saying that it needs to be broken, because:

> Until it is done, the Jews will continue to dominate the discourse and the US society, the Palestinians will suffer, the bankers will grow fat and prosperous, legal and illegal immigration will continue unabated. Saying "Jew" will have a liberating effect, like mouthing the name of Rumpelstiltskin. And it is much shorter.

Chapter Nineteen

Donald Trump and the "Russian" Mafia

On May 17, 2017, the Justice Department announced that it had appointed Robert Mueller as its special counsel to investigate "any links and/or co-ordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with" Trump's presidential campaign.[1] Mueller served as head of the FBI from 2001 to 2013, and during that time he distinguished himself by serving the interests of the woman who ran against Donald Trump in the 2016 presidential election. In 2005 Mueller closed the FBI grand jury investigation of the pardon which former president Bill Clinton granted to Marc Rich, who had been convicted of tax fraud. The fact that Rich's ex-wife had contributed to Hillary Clinton's Senate campaign and that Mueller quashed investigation into the sale of US uranium to Russia during Hillary Clinton's term as Secretary of State deepened doubts about Mueller's objectivity as special prosecutor and his ability to deal with charges of Russian collusion fairly. The same was true of Mueller's successor James Comey, but the Trump-Russia story continued at the Justice Department and in the main stream media because it served the interests of the Deep State, which had an interest in creating a conflict which justified its existence. During his presidential campaign, Donald Trump promised to find a peaceful solution to Cold War 2.0, which began when Victoria Nuland staged a coup d'etat in the Ukraine to protect the livelihood of hundreds of thousands of people who would have to find an honest way of earning a living if peace broke out with Russia. Once he became president, Trump had to deal with the people who had a vested interest in prosecuting Cold War 2.0.

Craig Unger's book *House of Trump House of Putin* is an indication that the publishing arm of the Deep State was as committed to Trump's removal from office as is the Special Prosecutor's office in the Justice Department.[2] After announcing a virtual army of editorial assistants in the book's introduction, Unger then blows no uncertain trumpet in stating his thesis. Donald Trump is "Putin's man in the White House,"[3] and Unger's book

> tells the story of one of the greatest intelligence operations in history, an undertaking decades in the making, through which the Russian Mafia

> and Russian intelligence operatives successfully targeted, compromised, and implanted either a willfully ignorant or an inexplicably unaware Russian asset in the White House as the most powerful man on earth. In doing so, without firing a shot, the Russians helped put in power a man who would immediately begin to undermine the Western Alliance, which has been the foundation of American national security for more than seventy years; who would start massive trade wars with America's longtime allies; fuel right-wing anti-immigrant populism; and assault the rule of law in the United States. The United States would have at its helm a man who would leave the country all but defenseless, and otherwise inadvertently do the bidding of the Kremlin.[4]

As the word "inadvertently" indicates, Unger is master of the extravagant claim followed by the pulled punch. The story that emerges is partly obvious and partly preposterous, and it all revolves around the equivocal use of the term "Russian." Unger spins a tale that is part guilt by association and part six degrees of Kevin Bacon.[5] As those familiar with that parlor game know, everyone is ultimately linked to everyone else on this planet in ways that may make for salacious gossip but, unfortunately for Mr. Mueller, not for criminal proceedings.

To give some indication of the Baconesque logic of this book, Unger tells us that Trump partnered with the Pritzger family in rehabbing the Commodore Hotel in New York in the 1970s with the help of the notorious Roy Cohn, who "helped Trump save $120 million through tax abatements from the city."[6] What Unger failed to tell us is that the Pritzger family was one of the main supporters of Barack Obama, both as senator from Illinois and president of the United States. The conclusion is clear. Since Roy Cohn was Sen. McCarthy's assistant at the notorious hearings of the '50s, Obama is controlled by Putin too. Or, maybe, by the ghost of Joe McCarthy. Or did I miss something here?

The logic of the book proceeds accordingly: Since the Russian mafia and the KGB are both Russian, the Mafia are working for the KGB. Since Donald Trump sold condos to Russian Mafiosi, Trump is working for the KGB. Since Putin is the head of the Russian government, Trump is working for Putin. It's that simple. Or, as Unger puts it, "Russian gangsters became, in effect, Putin's enforcers. This is not merely a metaphor. . . ."[7] No, unfortunately, this is what passes for logic in Unger's book. After the KGB "issued instructions to agents abroad to find US targets to cultivate," the Soviets "discovered a man," Donald Trump, "who was so intoxicated by a huge new clientele with boatloads of cash" that he "allowed the Russian Mafia to secure a significant new foothold in the United States."[8] Trump, therefore, was part of "an offensive that continues to assault America's most essential democratic institutions to this day."[9]

> With each new wild accusation, our admiration for Vladimir Putin grows. It turns out that Putin wasn't just responsible for recruiting Trump as his asset. He was also responsible for Brexit and the defection of nation after nation from the western alliance: The battle was against not just the United States but the West itself, as Russia repeatedly interceded in domestic politics in the United Kingdom, where it fueled the successful Brexit campaign, in which UK citizens voted to leave the European Union; in the Netherlands, where it backed Geert Wilders; in France, where it supported Marine Le Pen; in Ukraine, where it backed Viktor Yanukovych and other pro-Putin forces; and in Hungary, Poland, and elsewhere in Eastern Europe as well.[10]

After announcing that Putin had launched a "virtual World War III," Unger then tells us that "almost no one reported on it in the newspapers, on TV, on the radio, or on the Internet."[11] Which seems odd, since not a day goes by where I get my news without hearing something dire about the latest revelation from the Mueller investigation. Unger then contradicts himself by claiming that part of that virtual cyber war involved transforming "Facebook into one of the biggest purveyors of Russian propaganda on the planet."[12] Putin not only changed the algorithms at Facebook, he also "upended the very notion of truth, of reality itself, of what is real."[13] Which is quite an accomplishment, even for Vladimir Putin.

The machinations of the Russian premier also made Putin "the richest man in the world."[14] Lest we think that Unger is making it up as he goes along, the author attributes that claim to "Hermitage Capital Management CEO Bill Browder."[15] For those of you who don't know, William Felix Browder is the notorious CEO and co-founder of Hermitage Capital Management, which was the largest portfolio investor in Russia after the fall of Communism and also one of the biggest looters in one of the biggest looting operations in the history of the human race, the one that went by the name of "privatization" in Russia during the 1990s.[16] After Browder's Russian representative, Sergei Magnitsky, died in prison in 2009, Browder lobbied the U.S. Congress to pass the Magnitsky Act which Barack Obama signed into law in 2012, after which the Treasury Department put sanctions on a number of Russians. The Russian government responded by trying Browder in absentia for tax fraud and after his conviction sentencing him to nine years in prison.[17] When Andrei Nekrasov, the anti-Putin Russian Documentary film-maker set out to make a film on Browder, he believed the conventional narrative. By the time he finished the film, Nekrasov was convinced that Magnitsky died of diabetes and that Browder had used his connections with the mafia to steal $200 million from the Russian people.[18] Had Unger looked more closely into Browder and Magnitsky's dealings, he might have used them as examples of "Russian" control of our political system:

> What makes Browder so powerful? He invests in politicians. This is probably a uniquely Jewish quality: Jews outspend everybody in contributions to political figures. The Arabs will spend more on horses and jets, the Russians prefer real estate, the Jews like politicians. The Russian NTV channel reported that Browder lavishly financed the US lawmakers. Here they present alleged evidence of money transfers: some hundred thousand dollars was given by Browder's structures officially to the senators and congressmen in order to promote the Magnitsky Act.[19]

The "engine" behind the Magnitsky Act was Senator Ben Cardin, a Democrat from Maryland and "a fervent supporter of Hillary Clinton, also a cold warrior of good standing. More to a point, Cardin is a prominent member of the Israel Lobby."[20]

Like the story of Browder, Hermitage Capital and the Magnitsky Act, Unger's book is really about the looting of Russia after the fall of the Soviet Union in the 1990s. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the rise of the Russian Mafia were two sides of the same coin. Understanding the role of the Russian Mafia is crucial to understanding the bigger picture because, according to Unger, "without the Russian Mafia's move into New York, Donald Trump would not have become president of the United States."[21] This, it turns out, is a true statement, but not in the sense that Unger intends it.

This story began in September 1972, in a speech before the National Conference on Soviet Jewry, when Washington State Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson proposed linking U.S. trade benefits to emigration rights in the Soviet Union. As the name of the audience for this speech indicated, the emigration rights in question were restricted to Jews then living in Russia. After the passage of the Jackson-Vanik bill in 1974, 600,000 Jews left Russia and 40,000 of them ended up in Brighton Beach, the slightly tonier neighbor of Coney Island. In making this concession, the Soviet government opened up its jails as part of the emigration wave, ensuring that Brighton Beach would become a center of criminal activity in the coming decades.

Once the details begin to emerge it turns out that the Russian invasion wasn't Russian after all. It was Jewish. Unger could have revised his book by making a simple find and replace substitution. Find "Russian" and replace it with "Jew" and suddenly you have a completely believable book. Can anyone seriously dispute the claim that the Jews meddled in the 2016 election? Binyamin Netanyahu, to give just one example, came to the United States and used his carte blanche with the U.S. Congress to campaign for Donald Trump. We certainly don't need a Justice Department investigation to determine whether Jews have been meddling in American elections. They have been doing it for decades. Isn't that the purpose of AIPAC?

The same is *a fortiori* true of the so-called "Russian" mafia. As Matthew Johnson argued on the pages of *Culture Wars* nine years ago, "the entire 'Russian' mafia is Jewish, without exception, and they have used this to

deflect criticism."[22] Johnson bases his claim on *Red Mafiya*, the book by Robert Friedman, who happens to be Jewish and, therefore, well aware of how Jewish organizations have used the term "Russian Mafia" to shield Jewish criminals from prosecution. Being Jewish is a "shield" which has permitted the "Russian" mafia "to grow and prosper," largely because Jewish organizations like the Anti-Defamation League, one of the main organizations running interference for the "Russian" mafia "are the beneficiaries of largesse coming from organized crime."

The ADL was no stranger to laundering money from the Jewish Mob. During the '50s and '60s it took money from "Americans" like Meyer Lansky and Moe Dalitz. In 1982, the ADL helped Moe Dalitz go legit by honoring him with its Torch of Liberty Award. The ADL is, according to Johnson, one of the main reasons that "Jewish organized crime is considered an acceptable part of Jewish life." Because the ADL was one of the main beneficiaries of money from the Jewish mafia in America and the Jewish mafia in Russia, it has "lobbied law enforcement to stop investigations into this phenomenon, almost always with success."[23]

So is the problem Russians or is it Jews? What is true of Sigmund Freud is also true of Unger's book: what is true (namely the story of the rise of the Jewish mafia) is not new (Unger got it from Robert Friedman's book *Red Mafiya*) and what is new (the story of the rise of Trump as an agent of Vladimir Putin) is not true. Because he got so much of his material from Friedman's book, Unger is forced to admit that the feds were reluctant to go after Jews for "political reasons": "They turned a blind eye to it because so many of the Russians were Jewish. They didn't want to make problems for legitimate Jews in Brooklyn, and the overwhelming majority was legitimate. If they went off against the gangsters, they were afraid it would hurt Soviet Jewry, so there was no real effort."[24]

The situation in the NYPD was even more sensitive. As with the Feds, "a large part of the problem was political" because "the Russian mob was predominantly Jewish."[25] After "considerable criticism from the Jewish establishment," the NYPD's two-man [!] Russian mob unit got shut down because groups like the ADL claimed that "adverse publicity generated in the hunt for Russian Jewish criminals would foster anti-Semitism and jeopardize the continued emigration of Russian Jews to Israel and the West."[26]

As I said, what is true in Unger's has been shamelessly lifted from Friedman's *Red Mafiya*. Friedman however makes completely explicit the Jewish connection which Unger obfuscates. The FBI was reluctant to go after the "Russian" mafia because everyone in New York law enforcement knew that it was a Jewish operation. Or as Friedman put it:

> state and federal law enforcement agencies were loath to go after Russian mobsters, instead devoting their energies to bagging Italian wiseguys, a

> traditional route to promotion. And because the Russian mob was mostly Jewish, it was a political hot potato, especially in the New York area, where the vast majority of refugees were being resettled by Jewish welfare agencies.[27]

Unger mentions the Jewish connection largely because his material on the mafia is taken from Friedman's book, but then he deliberately subverts it by claiming that the mafia is Russian because if the mafia isn't Russian Unger doesn't have a book. The point of Unger's book is that Trump is a tool of Putin, via the Russian mafia. He makes this claim ignoring the fact that the first thing that Putin did when he came to power was to break the power of the Jewish oligarchs. If he had not done this, Russia would not be in existence today. Friedman claims that the looting of the Russian economy began in the 1980s under Gorbachev. He also claims it could not have happened without Jewish help:

> During Gorbachev's reign, the KGB began to hide communist party funds abroad, according to top-level Western and U.S. intelligence sources. The KGB consequently set up some two thousand shell companies and false-flag bank accounts, some as far away as Nevada and Ireland. Over the next eleven years, perhaps as much as $ 600 billion was spirited out of the country, in the greatest looting of a nation in world history. The KGB soon realized they needed outside help to complete the looting. At this point they turned to the Jews and their mafia.[28]

Within ten years of the passage of the Jackson-Vanik amendment:

> there were nearly nine thousand criminal gangs in Russia with 35,000 members. During "privatization," the period when the government put everything from the great oil and gas giants to hotels in downtown Moscow up for sale, organized crime and the Russian government continued their mutually beneficial relationship. The criminals needed export licenses, tax exemptions, below-market-rate loans, business visas, and freedom from arrest and prosecution for their crimes. All of this and more was available from corrupt bureaucrats, especially since inflation had wiped out the savings of everyone in Russia who wasn't participating in the grab. A dozen or so "oligarchs" took over vast state properties and became among the wealthiest men in the world.[29]

Before the fall of Communism in 1991, the Jewish mafia controlled between 40 and 80 percent of Moscow's economy.[30] During that time, federal law enforcement in America was crippled in dealing with Jewish crime in places like Brighton Beach because in 1984 the FBI, under the direction of William Webster, forged an alliance with the ADL, which effectively removed Jewish criminality from the agency's radar screen. Criminals like Moe Dalitz, who won the ADL's Torches of Liberty award, were replaced by "hate groups" as the focus of the FBI's attention. Not long after that, the FBI got in bed with

the Southern Poverty Law Center, which exacerbated an already bad situation. The FBI has since severed its relations with the SPLC, but its alliance with the ADL remains, and Unger's book indicates that the cover up of Jewish criminality is an essential part of the Deep State's hold on power.

The crucial turning point in both New York and Moscow came in 1991. After years of using leverage to fuel the reckless expansion of his gambling empire in Atlantic City, Donald Trump could no longer get the financing he needed to roll over his debts. In 1991, the Trump Taj Mahal, the architectural monstrosity on the Atlantic City boardwalk which Trump had called "the eighth wonder of the world," entered bankruptcy proceedings. That the Taj Mahal had cost Trump $1.2 billion was bad enough, but the fact that he had to cannibalize his other Atlantic City operations to keep it going only made a bad situation worse. By the end of the year, Trump was hopelessly in debt, and at this point Unger tries to link him with Putin: "As it happened, Donald Trump wasn't the only future president who had vital business relationships with the Russian Mafia. In Russia at roughly the same time, in the early and mid-nineties, the deputy mayor of St. Petersburg was also working with them. His name was Vladimir Putin."[31] Unger's bombshell style disguises the fact that there is no connection between the figures he has set out to vilify.

There is, however, a connection between the looting of Russia and the money laundering going on at the same time in the United States. In the early 1990s, Donald Trump started selling condos in Trump Tower to "Russians" who arrived in New York with suitcases full of cash, an operation which Unger is forced to admit is perfectly legal. The crucial link, however, is not Donald Trump and his casinos; it is Jeffrey Sachs and the Harvard Institute for International Development. Jeffrey Sachs was in the room with Boris Yeltsin when Yeltsin pulled the plug on the Soviet Union in December 1991. Sachs, who got his start in eastern Europe as a protégé of George Soros, had already made a name for himself as the man who had brought "shock therapy" to Poland by handing the heights of the Polish economy over to the looters who belonged to the former communist Nomenklatura and the Wall Street masters of the universe, who provided the cash for the looting.

Now it was Russia's turn, and Sachs "was more than game," claiming "If Poland can do it, so can Russia."[32] In late 1991, Yeltsin asked the Duma for unlimited power to transform the Soviet economy into a model of Chicago School capitalism. To do this, he assembled a team of economists who were then known as "the Chicago Boys" because of their fanatical adherence to the economic theories of Milton Friedman, who had made a name for himself as a professor at the University of Chicago. On October 28, 1991, Yeltsin announced the lifting of price controls, predicting that "the liberalization of prices will put everything in the right place."[33] In order to implement Friedman's plan for shock therapy in Russia, the U.S. State Department in the fall of 1992

awarded a $2.1 million contract to the Harvard Institute for International Development.

Contrary to what Unger says in his book, it was Yeltsin, not Putin, who opened the door for the Mafia takeover of the Soviet Union. According to Friedman:

> Yeltsin had vowed that a market economy would replace communism, but the shift was so abrupt that cash-rich gangsters rushed in to join forces with corrupt apparatchiks—including those in the KGB—and loot newly privatized state-held assets. Once that happened, the die had been cast. Instead of creating a truly democratic infrastructure and a market economy, Yeltsin essentially was allowing a handful of oligarchs to become enormously wealthy, in return for which he demanded their political support.[34]

Naomi Klein tells much the same story:

> the beneficiaries of the boom were confined to a small club of Russians, many of them former Communist Party apparatchiks, and a handful of Western mutual fund managers who made dizzying returns investing in newly privatized companies. A clique of nouveaux billionaires, many of whom were to become part of the group universally known as "the oligarchs" for their imperial levels of wealth and power, teamed up with Yeltsin's Chicago Boys and stripped the country of nearly everything of value, moving the enormous profits offshore at a rate of $2 billion a month. Before shock therapy, Russia had no millionaires; by 2003, the number of Russian billionaires had risen to 17, according to the Forbes list. . . . That is partly because, in a rare departure from Chicago School orthodoxy, Yeltsin and his team did not allow foreign multinationals to buy up Russian assets directly; they kept the prizes for Russians, they opened up the newly privatized companies, owned by so-called oligarchs, to foreign shareholders. The returns were astronomical.[35]

Klein failed to tell us that seven of the eight Russian oligarchs who snapped up the resources of the former Soviet Union at fire sale prices were Jews. Shock Therapy was Jewish as well. The biggest looting operation in the world's history was a Jewish operation on both sides of the Atlantic. The head of the American side of the looting operation was a Jew by the name of Jeffrey Sachs, the man Harvard appointed as head of the Harvard Institute for International Development in May 1995. Sachs' mentor and financial backer was George Soros, whose Open Society Foundation restructured one former communist country after another in eastern Europe to facilitate the liquidation of government enterprises and the transfer of those assets to Jewish bankers on Wall Street. Sachs's support team was Jewish as well: "After Yeltsin's coup, Stanley Fischer, the first deputy managing director of the IMF (and a 1970s Chicago Boy), advocated 'moving as fast as possible on all fronts.' So did

Lawrence Summers, who was helping to shape Russia policy in the Clinton Administration."[36]

Lawrence Summers, who was president of Harvard University from 2001 to 2006, was Deputy Secretary of the Treasury under "his long-time political mentor Robert Rubin"[37] during the years when Sachs was orchestrating the looting of the Soviet Union from his office at the Harvard Institute in Moscow. When the Russian parliament woke up to the magnitude of the looting which Sachs had enabled and revoked Yeltsin's special powers act, it was Summers who threatened the Russians with economic sanctions. "In the spring of 1993," according to Naomi Klein's account:

> Lawrence Summers, then US treasury undersecretary, warned that "the momentum for Russian reform must be reinvigorated and intensified to ensure sustained multilateral support." The IMF got the message and an unnamed official leaked to the press that a promised $1.5 billion loan was being rescinded because the IMF was "unhappy with Russia's backtracking on reforms."[38]

The Jews from Harvard and Wall Street had to hand Russia's wealth over to the Russian Jews because they were the only ones allowed by law to own the privatized wealth of the former Soviet Union. The Russian law which sought to prevent the exodus of privatized capital played into the hands of the Jews because they were the only group with the international reach and financial resources which could pull off the operation. The Jews who orchestrated the looting were united by a common animus against Russia which stretched all the way back to the time of the Russian revolution. As a manifestation of the traditional animus Jews held against the Czar, Joseph Stiglitz, "who at the time was serving as chief economist at the World Bank. . . called Russia's reformers 'market Bolsheviks,' for their fondness for cataclysmic revolution."[39] When Boris Yeltsin began acting like a Bolshevik himself, dispatching troops which bombarded the parliament that refused to bow to his wishes, Jeffrey Sachs lauded him for making "free market reforms," which were compatible in Sachs's mind with surrounding "the parliament with thousands of Interior Ministry troops, barbed wire and water cannons and refus[ing] to let anyone pass."[40] When 100 pro-democracy demonstrators died in the clash outside the Russian White House, Sachs dismissed them and the lawmakers they tried to defend as "a group of former communists intoxicated by power."[41]

Yeltsin got re-elected in the same year that Sachs got appointed head of the Harvard looting operation, largely because of $100 million in campaign contributions from the oligarchs who were on the receiving end of privatization, thanks to Yeltsin's collaboration with Sachs. The profits the oligarchs were making made their campaign contribution seem like small change by comparison. To give just one example: "Norilsk Nickel, which

produced a fifth of the world's nickel was sold for $170 million—even though profits alone soon reached $1.5 billion annually."[42]

Summers was eventually forced to resign as president of Harvard when that university ended up paying the largest fine in its more than 300 year history when the State Department successfully showed that the two men in charge of Harvard's operation in Moscow had personally enriched themselves by participating in the looting.[43] Given the amount of money they were raking in, it comes as no surprise that the "Russian" mafia "tried to buy its way into the American political system." Unger would have us believe that Trump was the only beneficiary of the hot money which flowed into New York during the Yeltsin era looting of the Russian economy, but that was not the case. If Unger had been honest in using Friedman's book as a source, instead of cherry picking it for ammunition to use against Donald Trump, he could have told us that the Democrats were the first group of politicians to benefit from the Jewish "privatization" of Russia. According to Friedman:

> By the dawn of the new millennium Russian mobsters were lavishing millions of dollars in contributions on Democratic and Republican politicians. In New York City, commodities mogul and alleged wiseguy Semyon (Sam) Kislin has been one of Mayor Rudy Giuliani's top campaign supporters. Kislin, various relatives, and his companies, raised or donated a total of $ 64,950 to Giuliani's mayoral campaigns in 1993 and 1997. A Ukrainian immigrant well known among the Russian Jewish community in South Brooklyn, Kislin has also made generous donations to Democratic Senator Charles Schumer as well as other state politicians.[44]

Senator Schumer, one of Trump's biggest opponents, is also Jewish, and unsurprisingly he was one of the beneficiaries of the hot money which flowed into New York as the Jewish mafia was busy looting Russia. But this is not how Unger portrays what happened. According to his explanation, the "strands had started to come together" when the "booming real estate market" in New York came in contact with "Vladimir Putin's festering bitterness about his country's humiliating Cold War defeat."[45] Unger is proposing a binary weapon. On the one hand, we have:

> Putin's dreams of reviving Russia's imperial glory. There was the newly globalized post–Cold War version of the Russian Mafia, still very much a state actor in league with Russian intelligence. There were untold billions of dollars in flight capital in anonymous shell companies in Cyprus, the Channel Islands, Panama, and other havens for dark money. There were sumptuous chateaux, villas, dachas, and estates, one bigger than the next; gigantic yachts; private jets; and all the rest, all part of a new culture of unimaginable greed.[46]

And on the other hand, we have:

> Donald Trump, emerging from a decade of litigation, multiple bankruptcies, and $4 billion in debt, to rise from the near-dead with the help of Bayrock and its alleged ties to Russian intelligence and the Russian Mafia. "They saved his bacon," said Kenneth McCallion, a former federal prosecutor who filed suit against [Jewish archcriminal Semyon] Mogilevich, Paul Manafort, Ukrainian oligarch Dmitry Firtash, and others on behalf of former Ukrainian prime minister Yulia Tymoshenko.

In the end, Unger proves nothing. This is Unger's version of the smoking gun: "Even though there's no evidence that Trump had direct contact with Ivankov or Mogilevich, throughout his three-day stay in Russia in November 1996, Trump and his entourage were escorted around Moscow by people with alleged connections to them."[47]

But, again, substitute "Jew" for "Russian" and you have a fairly accurate idea of what is going on. The Jews bailed out Trump then; the Jews control Trump now. Not that there's anything wrong with that. Unger once again pulls his punch when he writes: "Trump may well have been performing gigantic favors for Vladimir Putin without even knowing it."[48] If he had changed "Vladimir Putin" to "Sheldon Adelson" or "Semyon Mogilevich," Unger could have eliminated the uncertainty that haunts his book. He also could have come up with a plausible explanation for the incoherence of Trump's political program. Trump's campaign slogan was "Make America Great Again," but the philosophical foundation of his campaign was "America First," the movement led by people like Charles Lindbergh, Henry Ford, and Father Coughlin that was based in the industrial heartland of the American Midwest which tried to keep America out of World War II. Charles Lindbergh got into trouble when he claimed that the Roosevelt Administration, the English, and the Jews wanted to get America into World War II. Trump won the state of Indiana by castigating the Carrier Air Conditioning for its plans to relocate its Indiana plant to Mexico. The re-industrialization of America could have taken place in a rational fashion if Trump were not beholden to Jews who considered the well-being of Israel their first priority. When Trump took office, he implemented a hybrid program which was a mixture of America First when it came to domestic economic policies, and Israel First when it came to America's foreign policy. As I pointed out when I was in Mashhad, there are three reasons why Donald Trump moved the U.S. Embassy in Israel to Jerusalem: Sheldon Adelson, Paul Singer, and Bernard Marcus. America's foreign policy is controlled by three rich Jews, the same group of people who bailed out Donald Trump by buying condos at Trump Tower in the 1990s. Putin consolidated his power in Russia by reigning in the "Russian" mafia, not by doing their bidding. Trump came to power in America by doing the bidding of the Jewish mafia. His dealings with Russians, Mafiosi or otherwise,

were both coincidental and irrelevant, when compared with his dealings with Jews, as Unger's book shows in spite of itself. Unger cites Jonathan Winer, "the former money-laundering czar in the Clinton State Department," who claims: "There is not a major Russian organized crime figure who we are tracking who does not also carry an Israeli passport."[49] Even according to Unger's account, the Russian Mafia were all Jews with Israeli passports. If Russia became "a gangster state," as Unger alleges, the Jews were responsible.

The same could be said of the United States. The unintended conclusion of Unger's book is that the same group of people who took over Russia under Boris Yeltsin took over the United States during roughly the same period of time. Just as Boris Yeltsin fronted for Jeffrey Sachs in Russia, Bill Clinton fronted for Sachs' bag man in America, Larry Summers, at Clinton's Treasury Department in Washington. Both Nekrasov and Putin claim that a significant portion of Bill Browder's Russian swag ended up in the coffers of the Clinton Foundation.[50] The man who enabled this takeover of the United States was Bill Clinton, not Donald Trump. As Friedman points out in passages which Unger omits from his book, the first beneficiaries of Mafia money were Democrats like Bill and Hillary Clinton. In 1995, the DNC invited Grigori Loutchansky to a $25,000 a plate benefit dinner for the Clintons at the Hays Adams Hotel in Washington. Loutchansky would have attended, but the State Department denied him a visa at the last minute. The "Russian" mobsters, however, were determined to support the Clintons: "In September 1995, not long after the Loutchansky ban, his partner at NORDEX, Ukrainian mob boss Vadim Rabinovich, attended a Clinton-Gore fund-raiser at the Sheraton Bel Harbor Hotel in Miami."[51]

In the end, it turns out that the authors of the *Civiltà Cattolica* articles on the Jewish Question were right: any country which overthrows laws inspired by Christianity will end up being ruled by Jews. The propaganda campaign surrounding the Russiagate investigation into Trump, of which Unger's book is a part, proves that point.

Chapter Twenty

Jewish Privilege

In keeping with the so-called "Christchurch Call to Action" which flowed from a meeting of government officials and Internet giants on May 15, 2019 in Paris, Facebook issued an internal document entitled "Hate Agent Policy Review," which, according to *Breitbart*, which received a copy from a source inside Facebook, "outlines a series of 'signals' that Facebook uses to determine if someone ought to be categorized as a 'hate agent' and banned from the platform."[1]

The guidelines were simultaneously draconian and incoherent. You can be designated as a "hate agent" if "you praise the wrong individual, interview them, or appear at events alongside them."[2] Hate agent status is evidently contagious because Facebook may designate you as a hate agent if you associate with a "Designated Hate Entity," like the Englishman Tommy Robinson. You can also be designated a hate agent "merely for speaking neutrally about individuals and organizations that the social network considers hateful." Facebook tagged someone in October of 2018 simply because he gave what they considered a "neutral representation of John Kinsman," who is a member of "Proud Boys," a group which Facebook does not like and does not want you to like. So, in order to absolve yourself from any suspicion of being a "hate agent," you have to hate what Facebook hates.

The main way to characterize someone as a "hate agent," however, is to show that he engages in something called "hate speech." On June 20, 2019, YouTube banned the video "Owen Benjamin Finding Logos with E. Michael Jones," which had originally aired several months earlier on March 21. That interview was one of fourteen videos that YouTube banned from the E. Michael Jones channel on YouTube in June 2019. As with the other thirteen, the only explanation YouTube gave was that the video violated its rules concerning hate speech, *i.e.*, "We also don't allow any content that encourages hatred of another person or group of people based on their membership in a protected group." YouTube's notice did not identify the offending hate speech or the "protected group."

The terms "hate agent" and "hate speech" are equally vague; however the latter term is easier to define because its origins are clear. Hate speech is a creation of the Anti-Defamation League, which touts itself as "the world's leading anti-hate organization."[3] Like the analogous term "anti-Semitism," hate speech is any utterance which Jews at organizations like the ADL find offensive. As the incoherence of the Facebook guidelines have shown, it is impossible to understand the current wave of Internet censorship unless we see it as a Jewish operation. This becomes apparent when we look at how the press is defining (or misdefining) the whole censorship/deplatforming issue. An article in *Summit News* attributed the banning of "Natural News, which had 2.5 million followers," to "the fact that Facebook is now ruthlessly enforcing its far-left ideology across its own platform."[4] The fact that many if not most Jews espouse a far-left ideology is undeniable, but it is also beside the point because "hate speech" is not a political designation; it was created by the Anti-Defamation League to silence speech Jews' did not like.

Lest anyone think that is not the case, consider the "ADL Statement on YouTube Policy Changes to Reduce Extremist Content," a June 5, 2019 press release in which the ADL praised itself for causing the just initiated YouTube purge of "hate speech" channels and videos and then demanded more action by YouTube and other tech companies:

> "Online hate and extremism pose a significant threat – weaponizing bigotry against marginalized communities, silencing voices through intimidation and acting as recruiting tools for hateful, fringe groups," said Jonathan Greenblatt, ADL CEO and National Director. "That's why ADL has been working with technology companies, including YouTube, to aggressively counter hate on their platforms. We were glad to share our expertise on this and look forward to continuing to provide input. While this is an important step forward, this move alone is insufficient and must be followed by many more changes from YouTube and other tech companies to adequately counter the scourge of online hate and extremism."[5]

The ADL was created in the wake of the Leo Frank lynching in 1915 to engage in domestic spying and blackmail, if necessary, to protect Jewish interests in the United States. The ADL was also a money laundering operation. Jewish criminals like Meyer Lansky and Moe Dalitz got to label anyone who accused them of criminal activity an anti-Semite in exchange for large "charitable contributions" to the ADL. During Lansky's heyday, the ADL wasn't powerful enough to prevent his deportation, but that situation changed in the 1980s, when the ADL began its collaboration with the FBI. During that same decade, the ADL rehabilitated Moe Dalitz by giving him their Torch of Liberty award, again in exchange for large charitable contributions.[6]

THE ADL AND THE FBI

In 1928 a Russian Jew by the name of Meyer Lansky, who had grown wealthy from bootlegging in New York, correctly foresaw the end of prohibition in America and decided to re-invest the ill-gotten gains he had made from bootlegging in gambling. After the repeal of the Volstead Act in 1933, regional centers of vice like Newport, Kentucky re-tooled and became involved in gambling and prostitution. Loansharking provided a crucial link between the speakeasies of the past and the casinos of the future. After the stock market crash of 1929, bankrupt businessmen turned to Jewish bootleggers like Lansky for loans, setting in motion a process which would continue for decades, until by the '70s, "the lines separating the legal and illegal had become almost indistinct."[7]

In order to facilitate the transition from bootlegging to gambling as the focus of Jewish organized crime, Meyer Lansky convened a Jews-only meeting at Manhattan's Franconia hotel in November 1931 as his sequel to the Atlantic City meeting three years earlier.[8] In attendance at both conferences was Moe Dalitz, one of the capos of the Cleveland Mob, otherwise known as "the Jewish Navy," which shuttled Bronfman booze across Lake Erie from Canada [and the Detroit River] for nationwide distribution" in the United States.[9] Newport's involvement in the sale of alcohol became so lucrative during the 1920s that it attracted the attention of "the Cleveland Four—Moe Dalitz, Morris Kleinman, Louis Rothkopf, and Sam Tucker—one of the most powerful syndicates in the United States, second only to Meyer Lansky and his associates."[10] The Cleveland Four moved into Newport after assassinating Dutch Shultz, who owned the Coney Island Racetrack, a popular gambling venue in northern Kentucky. After Dalitz and company murdered Schulz they took over the racetrack and renamed it "River Downs," which was its name until it got renamed once again as Belterra Race Track, which is its name today.[11]

All cultural warfare in the United States takes place in the context of ethnicity as described by the sociological theory known as the Triple Melting Pot. According to that theory, ethnicity is based on religion. After three generations, Americans become ethnically identified as either Protestants, Catholics, or Jews, no matter what their country of origin. In Cincinnati, what started out as a Catholic-Protestant cultural conflict in the 19th century became a Catholic-Jewish conflict once Moe Dalitz and the Jewish Navy took over Newport, Kentucky across the river from Cincinnati.

F. Scott Fitzgerald depicted this quintessentially American conflict in his 1925 novel *The Great Gatsby* when Nick Caraway, the Catholic naïf from the Midwest, confronts Meyer Wolfsheim, Fitzgerald's rendering of Arnold Rothstein, the Jewish gambler who fixed the 1919 World Series. According to Ron Rosenbaum, "Wolfsheim is the symbol of all that is corrupt about

America. Corrupt and evil in a crudely caricatured, stereotyped Jewish way. Meyer Wolfsheim is Scott Fitzgerald's Shylock."[12] In Nick Caraway's eyes, the main source of moral corruption among Jews was gambling. Rosenbaum described Wolfsheim as "the Jew who, in Fitzgerald's vision, violated the innocence and despoiled the purity of an iconic American institution. He was the Jew who corrupted baseball—of all things." Furthermore, he had the intelligence to operate complex gambling operations and evade punishment. When Nick asked why Wolfsheim was not in jail, Gatsby casually responded "They can't get him, old sport. He's a smart man."[13] In his book, *Jüdisches Erwerbsleben*, Georg Ratzinger, Pope Benedict XVI's great uncle, wrote: "Jewish commerce can be characterized by two manifestations: 1) it is based on the exploitation of the work of others without any productive activity of its own and 2) it is characterized by gambling and speculation on the differential in values as the way to achieve riches."

The history of Jewish-run gambling in the United States runs from Arnold Rothstein to Moe Dalitz and Meyer Lansky, and from there to Sheldon Adelson, the Vegas casino owner who until the arrival of Donald Trump was the kingmaker in the Republican Party, and Dan Gilbert, the Jewish usurer in charge of Quicken Loans who now owns the J.A.C.K. casino in downtown Cincinnati. The men who used to be known as criminals are now considered philanthropists and patrons of the arts and control both political parties, which is the main reason why Adelson and Gilbert are not considered criminals. As Michael Timmons pointed out in an article in *Culture Wars* magazine:

> The American gambling industry has increasingly become more complex since Wolfshiem/Arnold "The Brain" Rothstein fixed the World Series in 1919. In fact, Rothstein inspired future generations of Jewish mobsters that built an empire of crime. Meyer Lansky organized and operated a network of casinos, formed the National Crime Syndicate, and used his financial resources to manipulate the American democratic process. Eventually he transformed gambling from an illegal vice into a popular tourism industry when he transformed Las Vegas into "Sin City," destroyed Cuba, and overthrew the government to set up lavish resorts in the Bahamas. Ultimately, Lansky took capitalism to its logical conclusion and inspired modern Jewish businessmen like Sheldon Adelson who exploit vice for profit.[14]

In 1935 J. Edgar Hoover parleyed the bureau of investigation he had run since the Red Scare that swept America in the wake of World War I into the Federal Bureau of Investigation, an operation which President Harry Truman considered Hoover's "private secret police force."[15] Upset by Hoover's abuse of federal power, Truman stated: "we want no Gestapo or secret police. The FBI is tending in that direction. They are dabbling in sex-life scandals and

plain blackmail. J. Edgar Hoover would give his right eye to take over, and all congressmen and senators are afraid of him."[16]

With the collaboration of Hollywood, which cranked out films glorifying "G-men," Hoover made a name for himself by going after bank robbers like John Dillinger. In directing the Bureau's attention to individual bank robbers, Hoover turned a blind eye toward organized crime in general and Jewish crime in particular, perhaps because Hoover was an inveterate gambler. Frank Costello gave him tips on horses.[17]

During the 1930s, the Cincinnati branch of the Anti-Defamation League approached local FBI agents, claiming that that city's isolationist German population had created a network of Nazi "subversives."[18] Indeed, the "ADL let the FBI make wholesale use of its files on neo-isolationists, whom the Bureau labeled 'subversives.'"[19] Hoover collaborated avidly with the ADL, which bragged that it had helped the FBI in 373 cases.[20] That particular collaboration ended abruptly on July 16, 1943 when Hoover received a memo from the United States Attorney General informing him that the individual danger classifications proposed by the Jewish informants "serve no useful purpose:"

> It is now clear to me that the classification system is inherently unreliable. The evidence used for the purpose of making the classifications was inadequate; the standards applied to the evidence for the purpose of making the classifications were defective; and finally, the notion that it is possible to make a valid determination as to how dangerous a person is in the abstract and without reference to time, environment, and other relevant circumstances, is impractical, unwise, and dangerous.[21]

In spite of the Attorney General's warning to Hoover that the ADL's "fact finding" was nothing but gossip which the Jews were using to settle scores with their opponents in the culture wars of that era, Hoover retained the Bureau's contacts with the ADL. He refused to break ties with the ADL because Jewish criminals like Meyer Lansky were paying the ADL to blackmail Hoover by gathering information about his homosexuality. Harry Truman also pointed out that Hoover was interested in blackmail. During the early '50s, Hoover provided Alfred Kinsey with immunity from prosecution for sex crimes in exchange for his files on the sex lives of the prominent figures who had contributed their sex histories to Kinsey's "scientific" research.[22]

One year after the creation of the FBI, the Beverly Hills Country Club, a popular night club in Newport, Kentucky, burned to the ground. Moe Dalitz was a frequent customer at the club and had made Peter Schmidt, the club's owner, repeated offers to buy him out. When Schmidt turned him down, the club mysteriously burned down. Schmidt rebuilt the club, but eventually got the message and sold out to Dalitz at a reduced price "under threat."[23]

Using tactics like this, Lansky and Dalitz took over Newport and brought about its transformation from a local "bust-out river city into a major regional gambling center."[24] After Dalitz took over the Beverly Hills Club, it "became as plush as anything in Las Vegas and boasted the same top Hollywood stars."[25] Eddie Levinson and Irving "Nig" Devine operated the Flamingo Nightclub and organized a layoff betting business, which would guarantee bets too large for local bookies to handle. Lansky's associates continued to eliminate competition when they "took over the Lookout House, across the Licking River near Covington, and gained control of several smaller casinos inside Newport."[26]

In 1941, after reaching a "working agreement" with Moe Dalitz and the Cleveland Syndicate,[27] Meyer Lansky bankrolled his protégé Bugsy Siegel to set up "an attractive center for gambling and prostitution" in the middle of the desert in Nevada. Lansky biographer Hank Messink, however, claims that Moe Dalitz was "the man who truly built Vegas," largely with Teamster Union money lent to Nevada's casinos.[28]

After World War II, what Messink refers to as "the casino era" of organized crime began in earnest with the establishment of regional centers of vice, or Sin Cities, like Newport, Kentucky. In terms of the money which changed hands, the casino era dwarfed prohibition, which "couldn't compare with the profits that rolled in from gambling—legal and illegal," now that the automobile could deliver customers to "regional gambling and vice centers," which drew "their patrons from the surrounding states."[29]

Moe Dalitz abandoned the Beverly Hills Club and left Newport for Las Vegas, where he repositioned himself as an upstanding citizen with the help of the Anti-Defamation League, which gave him its Torch of Liberty award in 1982 in exchange for hundreds of thousands of dollars of gambling money. Meyer Lansky wasn't so lucky. He had been pushing for legalized gambling since 1949,[30] convinced that organized crime was "only an extension of the free enterprise system."[31] He was equally convinced that the fastest way to turn gambling from a crime to a legitimate business was to use the money he acquired from gambling to bribe politicians: "It was therefore almost inevitable that an unofficial alliance should develop between the right wing of American politics and organized crime."[32] But he never succeeded in escaping his criminal past.

In addition to bribing politicians, Lansky and Dalitz gave large sums of gambling money to the ADL, which would in turn accuse anyone who claimed Lansky and Dalitz were gangsters of anti-Semitism. In addition to being steady contributors to the ADL, the Jewish gangsters of this era also supported Israeli terrorist organizations: "With support from Meyer Lansky, Hank Greenspun had become a gunrunner for Israel in 1948 and thereafter performed as an Israeli operative. Bugsy Siegel reportedly gave $50,000 to support Irgun while 'celebrity gangster' Mickey Cohen sponsored an Irgun

fundraiser in 1947."[33] The Israeli newspaper *Ha'aretz* could claim that "Jews control crime in the United States,"[34] but Meyer Lansky had the backing of the ADL when he claimed that "there was much anti-Semitism behind the campaign to convict him."[35]

After the feds failed to convict him of tax evasion in 1965, Dalitz would continue unhindered in a quest for respectability which reached a culmination of sorts when the ADL conferred on him its Torch of Liberty award. Jewish comedian Joan Rivers presented the award. As if to prove that you don't need to be Jewish to be honored by the ADL, that organization conferred its Torch of Liberty award on Hugh Hefner for distracting the world from the fact that Jews controlled pornography in America. To show that they had standards, the ADL never conferred any awards on Larry Flynt in spite of the hundreds of thousands of dollars he contributed to that organization.[36]

Needless to say, lots of money flowed from Dalitz's legit gambling operation into the coffers of the ADL, which, unable to work the same magic for Lansky, who died broke after getting deported from Israel, hired Lansky's granddaughter as their "liason [*sic*] to law enforcement."[37] The philosopher's stone which turned a mobster in Newport, Kentucky into a pillar of the community in Las Vegas, Nevada was "philanthropy."[38] According to Dalitz's daughter, who viewed the Freedom of Information Act files in the basement of the newly opened Mob Museum in Las Vegas, the FBI pursued Dalitz for 50 years, but he was never convicted of anything. He felt nonetheless "hounded and pursued," even though all the while "the dude was going legitimate" by building hospitals and the Las Vegas Country Club and being "a frequent donor to Vegas institutions and community organizations."[39]

The FBI's failure to prosecute Dalitz may be due to simple incompetence or there may be a simpler explanation: the ADL had used Lansky money to create their own file on Hoover. The Master of Blackmail was being blackmailed himself. This would explain why Hoover, according to Scott Thompson:

> was an enthusiastic collaborator of the ADL. As early as Sept. 8, 1941, he started to write directives to the effect that Bureau agents must maintain contact with the ADL, which was then based in Chicago. Hoover wrote dozens of letters over the decades to protect the ADL from those investigating or reporting on the ADL's criminal nature. During the McCarthy period in the early 1950s, Hoover praised the ADL's alleged role in the fight against communism in his book *The Masters of Deceit*, when many in the ADL were justifiably under probe as suspected Soviet agents and fellow travelers.[40]

J. Edgar Hoover could never break off his relationship with the ADL even though his agents kept warning him about the bogus nature of the intelligence the Bureau was receiving from them. Thompson claims that Meyer Lansky was using the ADL to blackmail Hoover over his homosexuality. Another

possibility is Hoover's gambling. The ADL's Sterling National Bank was founded in 1929 by Frank Erickson, a Lansky crime lieutenant who specialized in money laundering and who also "handled all of Hoover's horse race betting."[41] This does not explain, however, why the FBI's relationship with the ADL not only continued but intensified after Hoover's death in 1972.[42]

On February 4, 1985, then-FBI Director William Webster issued an order that represented "a virtual marriage between the two organizations."[43] In fact, that marriage has continued to this day. The last speech that FBI director James Comey made before being fired by Donald Trump was to the ADL, an organization he praised as indispensable to the FBI's work. In that speech, the Catholic Comey called the Holocaust "the most significant event in history."[44] The FBI broke off relations with the Southern Poverty Law Center, but gave no indication that the same fate awaited the ADL. In fact, as part of the ADL's influence over the FBI, Comey assured the ADL that the FBI would continue to "require every new FBI special agent and intelligence analyst in training to visit the Holocaust Museum" because "we want them to learn about abuse of power on a breathtaking scale."[45]

ONLINE HATE INDEX

Because the emergence of social media on the Internet posed a new threat to the Jewish control of discourse through Hollywood and the main stream media, the ADL teamed up with something called the D-Lab at the University of California at Berkeley to create what the ADL calls the "Online Hate Index." According to a video produced by the ADL:

> The goal of the Online Hate Index is to help tech platforms understand the growing amount of hate on social media, and to use that information to address the problem. By combining artificial intelligence and machine learning with social science, the Online Hate Index will ultimately uncover and identify trends and patterns in hate speech across different platforms. We've just completed our first phase of research [graphic: Machine Learning Model 78% to 80% accurate] and we found that the Machine Learning model Identified Hate Speech accurately between 78 and 80 percent of the time. [Blonde gives us a big smile] In the next phase of our project, we will aim at specific targeted populations in a more detailed manner. We will examine content on multiple social media sites, and we'll apply strategies to employ the model more broadly. While there's still a long way to go with artificial intelligence and machine based solutions, we believe that the Online Hate Index will help tech companies better understand the extent of hate on their online platforms by creating community-based definitions of hate speech.[46]

We're not just talking about the Jewish concept of hate speech as the operating system of Internet censorship, we're also talking about how the system of

censorship actually operates. On January 31, 2019, April Glaser, who identified herself as a journalist at *Slate*, wrote the following e-mail to an official at JP Morgan Chase demanding that it deplatform the Chase Paymentech account for the Proud Boys online store:

> Hi there,
>
> I'm April, a journalist at *Slate*. Writing to task if JP Morgan Chase is aware that the Proud Boys affiliated online store 1776.shop uses Chase Paymentech as its payment processor. 1776.shop is what's redirected from FundTheWest.Org, which Proud Boys founder Gavin McInnes cited as the legal defense fund of the Proud Boys.
>
> The Proud Boys are designated by the Southern Poverty Law Center as a hate group and members have engaged in group violence in Portland and New York City. The group has been suspended by Instagram, Facebook, and Twitter.
>
> Is the usage of Chase Paymentech in support of such groups against Chase's policy? On a deadline.
>
> Many thanks,
>
> April[47]

Glaser had already established herself as a crusader for abortion rights when she tweeted on December 21, 2018: "Search for 'abortion' on YouTube last week and the top results were a horrifying mix of gore and dangerous misinformation. YouTube changed the results after I asked."[48] Tim Pool, who was appalled at Glaser's abuse of journalism as an excuse to settle scores with her opponents in the culture wars, "wrestled with publishing the name of the journalist" in the YouTube video he did exposing her role in getting the Proud Boys deplatformed, but he was eventually forced to conclude that "April Glaser absolutely is not a journalist. At least, at the very least, you could call her an advocacy journalist, an activist . . . the e-mail she sent was designed to cleverly put pressure" on Chase, attacking someone whose beliefs she disliked by posing as a journalist who said in effect to Chase: "We're going to write a negative story about you, and we're on a deadline, and you support this group." Glaser believes in using journalism to restrict the speech of certain groups. In another context, she wrote a tweet in favor of Internet censorship, which she characterized as "not allowing hate speech to be broadcast to large audiences."[49]

Pool repeatedly refers to Glaser as an "activist." He claims that her *modus operandi* "follows an activist framework." The threat at the heart of her e-mail, however, revolves around mentioning the Southern Poverty Law Center, which is another Jewish organization similar to the ADL in its penchant for using the term hate speech as a weapon which against political opponents. "Activist,"

is, in this context, a euphemism for Jew. The accusation of hate speech derives its power to generate a certain outcome because of its association with the weaponization of anti-Semitism and the groups that use anti-Semitism to stifle any dissent. The ADL is one of those groups; the SPLC is another. Both are Jewish organizations that can wreck your life. Both the terms that get used and the organizations that use them are an example of what we might call Jewish Privilege.

CAPISTRANO ON JEWISH PRIVILEGE

Unlike the relatively recent term "white privilege," the term "Jewish Privilege" has a long history in Europe and was often the subject of sermons preached by saints. In his sermons, St. John Capistrano (who is discussed at length in chapter six of volume one) urged Jews to convert and expressed "sorrow and disappointment" at their failure to respond to the call of Christ to conversion.[50] He did not treat the Jews with contempt. The Jews were the enemies of Christians because they had rejected Christ, and as a consequence had waged on-going war of subversion against Christian faith and morals and the culture based on it. "The Jewish question," for Capistrano, "is a religious one."[51] Once the Jew accepted baptism, there was no difference between him and the Christian. In one sermon, Capistrano claimed that were the Jews to hear the word of God, he would love them as he loved his nearest relatives. But faith can never be compelled.

The Jews can only be invited not forced to believe. Belief can never be forced.[52] If the Jews refused to accept Christianity, however, certain consequences followed. The first is that Christians must be protected from their subversive and predatory activity. Jews should not be allowed "privileges that would weaken or abrogate those protective measures of Christian society."[53] He constantly preached against Jewish privileges, especially the privilege granted by princes to take usury on loans and the bad effects that had on Christian society. As a result he "urges that spiritual rulers insist on the strict observance of the laws concerning Jews and on the abrogation of contrary privileges."[54]

In Poland, he attacked Jewish Privilege, especially in the area of usury and tax-farming, claiming that these practices would cause Poland serious problems in the coming centuries. According to Heinrich Graetz, the father of Jewish historiography, when Capistrano met with King Casimir in Cracow, Capistrano "threatened him with the punishments of hell and prophesied a bad outcome in the war against the Prussian Knights if he didn't revoke the favorable privileges of the Jews and hand the Hussite heretics over to the bloodthirsty clergy."[55] When the war went badly, Graetz says, Capistrano attributed the defeat of the Polish army to the "privileges given to the Jews."[56]

Graetz considered those Jewish privileges a good thing, but Capistrano was convinced that privilege for the Jews led inevitably to moral laxity and subversion of the faith. As Graetz knew, the Jew was granted privileges not out of humanitarian concern but in return for financial concessions to the prince, specifically loans at lower interest rates. In return for making money available to the prince on favorable terms, the Jew was granted the privilege of lending to the burgher and peasant at much higher, clearly usurious rates. Once the Jew got the prince in his debt, he could demand other concessions too—the privilege to live among Christians, the privilege not to wear the badge which distinguished him from Christians, etc. Each of these privileges allowed the Jew closer contact with Christians, which he could exploit to his advantage.

Capistrano was against privilege for the Jews because it was the lowly who suffered. He felt that whenever there was free contact between Jews and Christians, the faith was endangered and morals suffered. Hence his strenuous efforts to keep Jews separated from the Christian population. Capistrano felt that Jews, because of their rejection of Christ, not because of their race, were a constant danger to Christian society. His view was consistent with the concept of "*Sicut Judaeis non . . .*" No one had the right to harm a Jew. No one had the right to force his conversion, but the Jew could not be a citizen with rights in a Christian society, nor could he be allowed to exploit his position as a resident alien to undermine the faith and morals of the native population. In a similar vein, Capistrano felt that the Jew could be tolerated but certainly not privileged. Capistrano's attitude toward the Jews was a function of his idea that the Christian state served as "the Christian empire of God here on earth."[57] According to Capistrano, "Christ is King, and Christ's Church is the kingdom of God. The Jews are the descendants of those who killed this king. They have inherited hatred against Christ from their ancestors, and they give it full vent wherever they can do so with impunity. Therefore we are justified in suspecting them. They are now simply our enemies and are known as such. They have crucified our Lord Jesus Christ."[58]

Capistrano's recommendations for social policy followed from that premise, and because he saw the deleterious results of contact between Jews and Christians in his day, he took the rigorist position against it:

> To prevent commercial and social contacts by strict enforcement of the laws concerning Jews, and to abrogate all privilege that stood against this plan, was the fundamental idea of Capistran's policy. How far did he succeed? … In Italy he did succeed in having edicts issued to abrogate Jewish privileges.[60]

HOMOSEXUAL PROXY WARRIOR

Jewish Privilege now finds its primary expression in terms like "hate speech" and "anti-Semitism," which have become weapons which any Jew (or their designated proxies) can wield to destroy your life if he or she doesn't like what you say. The main designated proxy in our day is the homosexual. As part of the moral panic which swept through Silicon Valley in the wake of the Christchurch Call to Action meeting in Paris, Apple's homosexual CEO Tim Cook adverted to the Jewish roots of homosexual privilege when he announced that "one of the most important" ways to fight online hate is by "how we honor a teaching that can be found in Judaism." He then cited Elie Wiesel, "may his memory be a blessing," who admonished us: "Do not be indifferent to the bloodshed of your fellow man. Do not be indifferent." So this means that Apple is opposed to abortion, right? Well, no, because April Glaser already clarified that issue. But, according to Cook, it does mean that those who oppose online hate need "to speak up for the LGBTQ community, for those whose differences can make them a target for violence and scorn."

At this point, Cook works himself up into the high moral dudgeon which we have come to expect from prominent homosexuals like Cook and the gay former mayor of South Bend, Indiana, Pete Buttigieg, who regularly lectures benighted heterosexuals about the superiority of his gay "marriage": "At Apple we believe that technology needs to have a clear point of view on this challenge. . . . That's why we only have one message for those who seek to push hate, division, and violence: You have no place on our platforms. You have no home here."[66]

Making full use of the homosexual privilege which Elie Wiesel has granted him as a homosexual proxy warrior for Jewish interests, Cook then engaged in an extended exercise in virtue signaling:[67]

> From the earliest days of iTunes to Apple Music today, we have always prohibited music with a message of white supremacy. Why? Because it's the right thing to do. And as we showed this year, won't give a platform to violent conspiracy theorists on the app store. Why? Because it's the right thing to do. My friends, if we can't be clear on moral questions like these, then we've got big problems. At Apple we are not afraid to say that our values drive our curation decisions. And why should we be? Doing what's right, creating experiences free from violence and hate, experiences that empower creativity and new ideas, it's what our customers want us to do. Technology should be about human potential. It should be about optimism. And we believe the future should belong to those who use technology to build a better, more inclusive, and more hopeful world.[68]

CHUBBY LESBIAN KIKE

Jewish Privilege involves the right to change the terms of the argument at will, with no regard to consistency. The main criterion of right and wrong and true and false is "Is it good for the Jews?," which is another term for Jewish Privilege. The same group that used the First Amendment to justify pornography is now saying things like this:

> "One point of this case is to make it clear to anyone considering this, if you do that, there will be very large judgments against you that will follow you until they are paid," she said, noting that it is unlikely plaintiffs will be able to collect, in part because some of the defendants are in hiding and others are broke. "Our hope is that will act as a deterrent for people to engage in organized racialized violence."[69]

The author of that quote is Roberta Kaplan, a Jewish lady who wields the weapon known as Jewish Privilege in the culture wars even more fiercely than April Glaser and Tim Cook, and she is speaking of the case *Sines v. Kessler.* In case you haven't heard of her, Kaplan is "a new and formidable enemy" of all "haters."[70] According Helen Chernikoff's adulatory article in *The Forward*, Kaplan is: "a Jew, a lesbian and one of the country's most celebrated trial lawyers. She wears pantsuits and a Star of David necklace. In her home state of Ohio, she helped Hillary Clinton campaign before the 2016 election."[71] In keeping with the narcissism we have come to associate with people like this, during an interview in Kaplan's office in the Empire State Building, Kaplan bellows at the reporter from *The Forward*:

> "What do they say about me on Twitter?" Kaplan asked rhetorically and gleefully, in her booming voice. "They call me a chubby lesbian kike! I say I'm definitely chubby, I'm definitely a lesbian, I'm definitely Jewish."

Before we go on to ponder Ms. Kaplan's accomplishments, it's worth asking what might have happened to someone who made those comments on YouTube but was not in possession of Jewish Privilege. If I refer to Ms. Kaplan as a "chubby lesbian kike," don't I run danger of getting de-platformed after showing up on the ADL's Online Hate Index? Since robots make the first sweep, don't I run that danger simply by quoting Ms. Kaplan's description of herself? The answer is yes, and we suspect that Ms. Kaplan not only understands the double standard but positively exults in it as one of the prime perks of Jewish Privilege. She is above the law. She can say openly something that would get the *goyim* in big trouble if they got uppity enough to repeat it.

> From a private school in suburban Cleveland to Harvard College, Columbia Law School, white-shoe law firm Paul, Weiss and the Supreme Court bar, her affiliations are all exclusive. Her most high-profile achievement to date, *United States v. Windsor*, has been persuading the Supreme Court that the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA) was

> unconstitutional, and winning for LGBTQ Americans like herself the right to marry.

Kaplan fought the *Windsor* case on behalf Edith Windsor, a lesbian who along with Kaplan was a member of Congregation Beit Simchat Torah, the LGBTQ synagogue in Manhattan.[72] After the Supreme Court used that case to declare the Defense of Marriage Act unconstitutional on June 26, 2013, Kaplan achieved fame as the litigator who overturned DOMA. As a result of that victory, Ms. Kaplan became "a walking, talking combination of things that piss [Charlottesville organizer Mike] Peinovich and his ilk off, and she knows it." Ms. Kaplan is currently representing Elizabeth Sines, who is a class of 2019 University of Virginia law student who lives with a queer woman,[73] and nine other plaintiffs in *Sines v. Kessler*, the lawsuit she filed against Jason Kessler and 24 other defendants whom she alleges to be the leaders of the Charlottesville protest. Sines, unlike many of the white protestors at the Charlottesville demonstration, was not injured during the demonstrations. However, she claims that merely seeing the car killing protestor Heather Heyer has left her "still traumatized, afraid even in her own home."

Kaplan's contempt for her opponents in *Sines v. Kessler* is palpable:

> A lot of these guys are like overgrown, immature young men who kind of live in their parents' basement and in the past, they just communicated with each other. . . . For whatever reason—some would say it had to do with the presidential campaign—they felt compelled to come out of the basement, which they have a right to do, but also to plan and commit violence motivated by their ideology.

Equally palpable is her thirst for revenge. "A shorthand way of thinking about what we want here," she tells the reporter from *The Forward*, "is that they should go back into their basement and communicate on chat rooms rather than hurting or even killing people." Just as April Glaser used journalism as a weapon in the culture wars, Ms. Kaplan plans to put her contempt for a certain class of people into action by using "the law to make them pay for what happened in Charlottesville, even if it means garnishing their wages, and to make sure they don't ever do anything like that again." One legal colleague who worked with her on the DOMA case gave a similar description of how Ms. Kaplan views the legal system in the United States: "She's going to fight Nazis and fight for LGBTQ rights and make some money at the same time. . . . Since she told me she was going to do it, I knew she was going to do it."

The law may be her area of combat, but homosexuality is the vehicle which allows Ms. Kaplan to put Jewish revolutionary activity into practice. In Kaplan's mind, the two identities are hopelessly entertwined: "I remember thinking when I first came out 'What's more important to me, my Jewish or my gay identity?' It's not a question anybody should have to answer."[74] Just as becoming a Bolshevik was the fullest expression of the Jewish revolutionary

spirit at the beginning of the 20th century, homosexuality is now an expression of putting her Jewishness into practice.

Needless to say, Ms. Kaplan's mother didn't feel this way when her daughter came out. So upset was she, that she responded by banging her head against the wall after learning that her daughter was a homosexual, but she soon got over it. Kaplan continued attending synagogue services as "her career flourished," and it was at Rosh Hashanah services at the Congregation Beit Simchat Torah that she met Rachel Lavine, whom she would "marry" in a ceremony in Toronto because the United States did not recognize marriage between members of the same sex at the time. In her autobiography, *Then Comes Marriage: How Two Women Fought for and Won Equal Dignity for All*, Kaplan relates "spending 'romantic evenings heatedly arguing about the relative political power of the Mensheviks versus the Bolsheviks during the Russian Revolution.' (Lavine said Kaplan would have been a Bolshevik, just because she needs to win. Kaplan was not happy.)" Bolshevism was, of course, the Jewish revolutionary movement which took over Russia at the turn of the 20th century. In that movement, Jewish "activists" like Lev Trotsky felt they had the right to murder thousands of Russians to bring about their notion of a better world. Now Ms. Kaplan feels that she has the right to ruin your life if you disagree with her idea of social progress for homosexuals or Jews.

Kaplan filed *Sines v. Kessler* after the white boys had the temerity to emerge from their mother's basements. And why are these men, mostly in their twenties, living in their mother's basements? Because they are burdened with student loan debt and can't get a job. Does Jewish usury play a role in their lives? And what are they doing in their mother's basements? Watching porn and masturbating? And who is responsible for pornography? Charlottesville was an inchoate protest against Jewish moral subversion, and it was inchoate because its leaders defined themselves as white. As soon as the protest organizers came close to presenting a coherent picture of what was driving them to protest, they were denounced as anti-Semites.

Now the white boys are going to pay for daring to emerge from their mothers' basements:

> The plaintiffs will ask for money to compensate them for their suffering, although it's unlikely the defendants will be able to pay the damages, Kaplan said. That means their collective future might include years of garnished wages, *a regular reminder that they overestimated their abilities and importance in Charlottesville.* The plaintiffs could also seek an injunction that would prevent these groups from planning violence. If they do it anyway, they could be held in contempt, which could lead to penalties or maybe even jail time. (Emphasis mine.)

Kaplan is planning to show that the Charlottesville organizers were engaged in a conspiracy to commit murder. In keeping with the narcissism which is

the dominant character trait of the homosexual, Ms. Kaplan thinks she may have a chance to persuade the jury because she has "this amazing ability to persuade myself that all my clients, whoever is my client, have done nothing wrong. . . . I know people say I'm crazy when I say this, but I don't distinguish at all really between my corporate clients and the plaintiffs in Charlottesville and Edie Windsor. My job is to believe in the rightness of their cause" as long as that cause corresponds to the Jewish revolutionary spirit "and get them justice."[75]

The only thing that makes the preposterous claim that the white boys went to Charlottesville with the intent to commit murder plausible is Jewish Privilege. If the Jew says you are an anti-Semite, you have no court of appeal because he has Jewish Privilege and you do not. The same is true of hate speech.

> The lawsuit accuses Charlottesville's organizers of conspiring to bring about a campaign of violence and intimidation under the pretext of planning an ostensibly peaceful exercise in free speech. That is, a bunch of racists planned a violent march, not a march that just happened to get violent. The distinction is crucial.

If violence is her concern, why isn't Ms. Kaplan prosecuting Antifa, the one group that clearly showed up in Charlottesville with violence on its mind? "Notwithstanding claims that Antifa is a peaceful, 'anti-fascist community-defense group,' it has adopted tactics that often are more violent than those of the right-wing movements that the group opposes."[76] When Milo Yiannopoulos was to give a talk at the University of California, Berkeley on February 1, 2017:

> he was prevented from speaking by a group of 150 or so masked, black-clad members of a then-obscure movement calling itself "Antifa." The protestors caused $100,000 worth of damage to the campus and injured six people as they threw rocks and Molotov cocktails. Nine months later, again at Berkeley, an "anti-Marxist" rally descended into violence as approximately 100 masked Antifa members harassed journalists and beat rally organizers and attendees.[77]

As in the case of April Glaser and *Slate*, the journalists are in bed with the terrorists:

> Their allies in this mission include trolls such as AntiFashGordon, the pseudonym of a Twitter user who declares that "I expose fascists, get them fired, de-homed, kicked out of school etc," and brags that he passes "dossiers" of doxes to national-level journalists, whom he refers to as "our contacts." His entire online mission is to ruin other people's lives, and it is a mission being supported by "contacts" like Mathias and Wilson. In providing such support, they are discrediting their publications and misinforming their readers.[78]

WHO DEFINES HATE?

The crucial issue is who gets to define "hate"? Who gets to define "violence"? The SPLC has never designated Antifa as a hate group. As a result, not one member of Antifa was charged with inciting violence at the Charlottesville rally. Because of its roots in Bolshevism, Antifa becomes, like the homosexual, a bearer of Jewish Privilege, something which comes in handy in places like Charlottesville when the local District Attorney hands down indictments. The same is true of anyone who supports abortion. They too become bearers of Jewish Privilege by proxy because abortion, while undoubtedly violent and bloody, has the support of most Jews, who define it as a basic right. The same is true of pornography. Is pornography a form of violence? The answer is no, not because it isn't intrinsically and oftentimes explicitly violent, but because the Jews who control the pornography industry have defined it as a form of freedom of speech. Why is pornography not part of the discussion of violence on the Internet? The answer to that question is Jewish Privilege. When Catherine MacKinnon and Andrea Dworkin claimed that pornography was violence against women, Betty Goldstein Friedan stepped in and defended the pornographers because they as Jews shared in Jewish Privilege.

In spite of Roberta Kaplan's efforts to punish them, the men who are the main victims of pornography are starting to emerge from their mothers' basements. Virtually every week now, I get letters like the following:

> Dr. Jones,
>
> I am writing anonymously because of the topic. I'd rather not even write this, but the joy of Our Lord demands that I do.
>
> I'm male, good Catholic family. When I was 13, nearly 14, I discovered self-gratification. At the time I pretty much thought I had found my calling in life with self-gratification. I had some idea that the act was shameful, but I had no idea. I had seen some pornography, but I had enough sense to tell that porn – at least – is wrong. Perhaps a year-and-a-half later, my parents probably caught on to my self-gratification, and my dad dropped hints about how it's a mortal sin. The day that he said that to me was one of the worst days of my life. I was shocked, horrified. I really had no idea. Now this was the '80s and everything was weak and ridiculous in the Catholic Church, especially in our diocese, and I have been struggling with this problem on-and-off since then – roughly three decades!!
>
> But I have been listening to your podcasts about "Libido Dominandi," and it's changed me. In the last couple of weeks, my desire for self-pleasure is gone. Why? If rat b@stards like George Soros et alii want me to self-abuse so as to neutralize me and thereby destroy my ethnos, then screw

> them!! Now I can even see attractive women and 95% of the time I can even appreciate that they are sexually attractive with no personal desire.
>
> I understand that it would be much more ideal if I'd overcome this because I love Jesus so much more than personal pleasure . . . but what can I say? I am a sinner. I am selfish. But I will be damned if I am going to help those rotten oligarchs to ruin the world. SCREW THEM! I'd rather take a bullet than help those rotten SOBs do anything.
>
> So I suppose I am a very broken person that it took me impudence against my enemies to overcome this vice, instead of love for God. But you have changed my life forever. It's only been two weeks, but I can tell. It's different this time. I can only imagine that even if I don't love Him like I should, that Our Lord, and also Our Lady and my guardian angel, etc., are absolutely delighted that at least my vice has evaporated. I owe that to you, Dr. Jones; you are an answer to three decades of prayer. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. I am weeping as I write this. Thank you so very much.
>
> God bless you.
>
> Anon

Jewish "activists" like Kaplan have a license to ruin your life. The name of this license is Jewish Privilege. As the white boys scrambled to pay their legal bills, Ms. Kaplan made plans to spend the summer at the Hamptons, where she attends a conservative synagogue:

> After the DOMA victory, the Conservative Synagogue of the Hamptons celebrated by commissioning the composition of a new piece of music that is set to verses from Psalm 85: "Kindness and truth have met; righteousness and peace have kissed. Truth will sprout from the earth, and righteousness will look down from heaven."

Summer, we are told, is:

> a deeply spiritual season for Kaplan. Even she slows down and can take more time to go to services. Also, the season leads up to the High Holidays. Those are her favorites, she said, because they are so conducive to private prayer and connection with God. It's God, Kaplan said, who inspires people to act selflessly, bravely, kindly.[79]

God so far has not favored Elizabeth Sines. *Sines v. Kessler* is still dragging through the courts.[80] Mike Enoch extricated himself from the suit when he successfully defended himself *pro se*. James Fields, the rally-goer who killed counter-protester Heather Heyer by driving his car into a crowd of people, was sentenced to life in prison for murder in December 2018.[81] In March 2019, Fields pled guilty to federal hate-crime charges, as part of a deal in which prosecutors agreed not to seek the death penalty;[82] on June 28, he was instead

sentenced to life in prison.[83] Charlottesville Police Chief Alfred Thomas resigned abruptly on December 18, 2017, just seventeen days after the release of a report that was highly critical of the police department's handling of the Charlottesville rally.[84] Former U.S. Attorney for the Western District of Virginia Timothy Heaphy claimed that Thomas told officers in the police command center that day to "Let them fight for a little. It will make it easier to declare an unlawful assembly."[85] Summing up the meaning of *Sines v. Kessler* with the benefit of two years of hindsight, Roberta Kaplan opined: "It's pretty hard to shock me, and the one thing that I found in this case to be really quite shocking is that while all these defendants hate blacks and LGBT, are not thrilled with Hispanics and women, the one element that is their *raison d'etre* is anti-Semitism."[86]

The irony in this statement only becomes apparent if we view Jewish Privilege as something inhering in "the Jews," and not in any one particular Jew, because each Jew has plausible deniability that absolves him from any responsibility for upholding the privilege he enjoys. So Dr. Michael L. Brown, a self-described "Jewish follower of Jesus,"[87] can call me anti-Semitic[88] but say that he doesn't want me to go to jail for disagreeing with him. And Israel's UN ambassador, Danny Danon, can say he wants anti-Semitism criminalized,[89] but claim that he never called me an anti-Semite. But if we put both comments together as an expression of Jewish Privilege, the consequences become clear. If they get their way, you will go to jail for disagreeing with a Jew.[90]

Similarly, sixty years ago, Jewish "activists" like Leo Pfeffer could claim with a straight face that Jews were in favor of free speech, and, indeed, sixty years ago they were because they had not yet completed the dismantling of this culture's protections of sexual morality. The Jews then were in the forefront of undermining anti-obscenity and anti-abortion laws. With the sexual lure as the bait, they persuaded the *goyim* to abandon the moral law. Once this happened, social anarchy followed. Since anarchy is intolerable, a new code had to be imposed. That new code used to be known as political correctness; it is now known by its opposite, namely, hate speech, which is, as we have indicated, a Jewish creation. Unlike practical reason or the moral law, this new code is an irrational mish-mash of virtue signaling and identity politics, *i.e.*, racial and sexual politics. Because this code is irrational, its imposition on the overwhelming majority of the people of the United States and, now, the world, creates violence. Mayor Buttigieg's preaching of homosexual privilege (a variant on Jewish Privilege) created violence in South Bend, Indiana because any time anyone preaches contempt for one part of the moral law (the sixth commandment, for instance) he preaches contempt for all of it, and any deviation from the moral law leads eventually and inevitably to violence. When violence breaks out—as it did in Charlottesville—Jewish Privilege determines who will get punished while the real perpetrators of violence, in this instance Antifa, will go unpunished. This, of course, leads

to more violence, as the Poway synagogue shootings showed, and we have to conclude that the creation of violence is intentional because it justifies more draconian forms of control. All artificially created codes of behavior, in other words, lead to violence because all are ultimately the imposition of the will of the powerful on the behavior of the weak with—and this is the important point—no regard to Logos or the real order of the universe which is based on the mind of God and demands justice. Jewish Privilege is, therefore, the main source of violence in our day, and it needs to be confronted as such before we all end up suffering the fate of Jez Turner in England. St. John Capistrano, pray for us.

Chapter Twenty-One

Nazi Hunters
and their Catholic Proxy Warriors

Over the course of 2019 the Jews lost control of the narrative in America. When Jews lose control they get upset, because, in a world without logos, the only order is the order they impose on the rest of us, a group known as the *goyim*, whom, Jews believe, have a natural tendency toward anti-Semitism. When the Jew loses control, he thinks the world is out to get him, and when he thinks the world is out to get him, his thoughts turn to murder. As a result, we are subjected to one paranoid Jewish fantasy after another advocating murder as the solution to what they perceive as the problem of anti-Semitism. A year ago Amazon Prime members were subjected to *The Man from High Castle*, a fantasy about what America would be like after losing World War II. In mid-March Netflix released the film version of Philip Roth's paranoid fantasy *The Plot Against America*, and in late February Amazon Prime released *Hunters*, probably the most flagrant example of Jewish paranoia leading to Jewish murderous fantasies to date. *Hunters* is set in America in 1977. In the opening scene, a Jewish couple arrive at a barbecue given by the husband's new employer, an obnoxious white southerner (Is there any other kind?) wearing a "Kiss the Cook" apron as he presides over grilling hot dogs, which is of course prescient of the Holocaust. After our obnoxious Southern host makes some tactless sexual remarks, the Jewish wife, who looks to be in her thirties, suddenly recognizes him as a former officer in Auschwitz. After trying to brush off her distress with a few humorous remarks, the southerner pulls a gun out of the barbecue and shoots not only the Jewish couple but every member of his own family as well. He then sits down in a lawn chair, where he waits for 24 hours until a fellow Nazi arrives to dispose of the bodies and then shoot him in the arm to give him an alibi.

Does that sound plausible to you? Well, it's as plausible as this paranoid piece of Jewish revenge porn gets. *Hunters* tells the story of how Meyer Offerman, "a wealthy Holocaust survivor with a thick Yiddish accent played by Al Pacino," based loosely on Simon Wiesenthal, who got into the Nazi hunting business in 1977, assembled "a diverse band of Nazi hunters" to kill anyone they suspected of being Nazis from taking over America and turning it

into—you will be expecting this—the "Fourth Reich." Jonah Heidelbaum, the protagonist in this struggle, is a young man whose grandmother got murdered by a man in a black hat, whom Offerman identifies after introducing himself at Grandma's wake as a Nazi hunter. Jonah initially ignores Offerman's offer to help, but soon gets busted for selling dope, and when Offerman goes his bail, their collaboration begins.

Unfortunately, Jonah shows some initial reluctance at killing people in cold blood even if they're Nazis. As a result, Offerman spends a good part of the conclusion of the first episode trying to convince Jonah that his homicidal rampage is religiously and morally justified: "This is not murder," Offerman tells Jonah, "This is mitzvah," which means duty in Hebrew. Once again Hollywood has drawn us into an alternative universe where hate is a Jewish virtue, and we become anti-Semites who are complicit in Nazi crimes if we object to Jews gunning down in cold blood anyone they find suspicious.

Director David Weil told the *Jewish Telegraph Agency* that "his first and main inspiration was his grandmother, who survived imprisonment in the Auschwitz and Bergen-Belsen concentration camps, and whom Weil said he used to see as a superhero while growing up in a Conservative Jewish family on Long Island." Hunters is "a love letter to my grandmother, it is a way to honor my birthright and my heritage and my Judaism, and it's a way to shed light on hidden crimes and secrets."[1]

Weil also had specific movies in mind when he directed Hunters, which is a mash up of Steven Spielberg's *Munich* and Quentin Tarantino's *Inglourious Basterds*. "If 'Inglourious Basterds' is one end of the spectrum, and 'Munich' is the other end of the spectrum, I think 'Hunters' lives in the middle," Weil said in the same interview.[2]

Hunters is also about morality, as Jews like Weil defines that term, which means in this instance comic book morality according to which "The center of the [*Hunters*] series really revolves around the moral, ethical question about 'Does it take evil to fight evil? Do you have to be a bad guy in order to effectively combat the bad guys?'" Logan Lerman, who plays the show's protagonist Jonah Heidelbaum, says in a phone interview from Los Angeles. "I'm really curious to see what people's responses are."[3]

As Weil indicates, we have been down this road before. Steven Spielberg's *Munich*, an epic drama about Mossad agents who seek to retaliate against the Palestinians responsible for the "Munich Massacre" at the 1972 Olympics, offers two arguments for the need for violent Jewish revenge—one is the biblical eye-for-an-eye means of paying back the Nazis for the suffering they caused. *Hunters*, which gets its moral theology from *Munich*, is full of flashbacks to scenes of chilling Nazi atrocities, such as a chess match that SS officers play involving real prisoners, who are forced to kill each other as the game progresses. The other argument is one of self-defense. As the hunters torture a Nazi by blaring loud music into his ears, Jonah urges them to stop

— he is clearly conflicted by inflicting pain on someone else. But since the goal of the torture is to extract information about who else the Nazi might be working with in order to stop a possible plot that could harm Jews and others, he reluctantly accepts the death of the Nazi they were trying to interrogate.

Similarly, in Spielberg's *Munich*, the Israelis agonize a lot over killing Palestinians. *Munich* is about revenge, but it is also a film about morals and epistemology. It is a film about Mossad agent Avner Kauffman's involvement in killing nine people he assumes were involved in the Munich massacres. As the film proceeds, it becomes clear that he really has no way of knowing if the people he blows up or guns down are guilty because he is simultaneously judge, jury and executioner, and people with all three of those duties are notoriously lax in fulfilling their responsibilities. Avner Kauffman killed Mr. X because the secular equivalent of the rabbis, in this case the Mossad, told him that Mr. X was guilty. There was no trial. The guilt of the Palestinians is certain because someone in the Mossad said so. Disagreement is not an option. Anyone who disagrees with the rabbi gets expelled from the synagogue. *Munich* is Jewish discourse with a vengeance—in just about every sense of the word.

Munich may be a movie about the rules of Jewish discourse, but it is also a movie about how giving the wrong answer to a Jew will result in your death. Wa'il Zu'aytir's "trial" consists of the two Israeli assassins questioning the Palestinian with the loaded guns in their shaking hands aimed at his head and vital organs. This lesson in Jewish discourse begins with a question: "Are you Wa'il Zu`aytir?" Before getting a satisfactory answer to that question, the assassins move on to their second question: "Do you know why we are here?" The second question has an eerie existential ring to it, as if the Israeli hitmen are asking themselves some vague question about the purpose of their mission and, by extension, their lives as well. Having failed to answer either question to their surprise quiz correctly, the unarmed elderly Palestinian translator gets gunned down in cold blood. The question the murderers forgot to ask is "Did you have anything to do with Munich?" If he had said "no," would they have shot him anyway? Or would this have called for more facial agonizing by the handsome movie star (Eric Bana, who played Hector in *Troy*) who played Avner Kauffman?

ABOVE THE LAW

Is Abu Khalid telling us the truth when he says that Zu'aytir had nothing to do with the Munich massacre? Or was Avner right in his belief that Zu'aytir was involved with Black September? The answer to this question is that civilized peoples and nations do not conduct inquiries with loaded guns aimed at the heads of people expected to answer these questions. In a civilized world, people suspected of murder are apprehended by the police and put on trial. People who think that they have some God-given or racially conferred

right to question and execute suspects are not part of the civilized community of nations. They are criminals and they should be treated as criminals. At one point this thought even occurs to Avner Kauffman. "Couldn't we just arrest him and put him on trial like Eichmann?" The answer, according to Avner's Mossad handler is "no" because in the meantime more Israelis would die. The moral logic of this response—or the lack thereof—convinces Kauffman that he has to go on killing.

Hunters picks up where *Munich* left off. *Hunters* is about the moral education of Jonah Heidelbaum at the hands of Meyer Offerman, who begins his course by promoting revenge. "Living well is the best revenge," Offerman claims, citing the Talmud. Jonah becomes a Nazi hunter because his grandmother, who survived Auschwitz, was murdered by a Nazi doctor from Long Island. Toward the end of the first episode, Jonah starts to express moral qualms about taking the law into his own hands. "Did you tell the authorities?" Jonah wonders.

At this point, Al Pacino, the Hollywood star who plays the moral center of the film, sets young Jonah straight. Because the American legal system is effectively in the hands of Nazis and Nazi sympathizers, Jews have to become vigilantes and take the law into their own hands. When Jonah wonders why they don't just go to the police, Offerman says:

> Well, we tried. We went through all the proper channels but . . . we were laughed at. They didn't believe us. So I took the matter to the senators I know, the congressmen that I got elected but they ignored me. No one dared stake their reputation on investigating some Jew killings. So with nowhere else to turn we made a vow. We would find these criminals ourselves. And bring God's justice to bear on them.

"You mean murder them?" Jonah asks.

THE BEST REVENGE

"Murder?" Offerman responds. "No, Jonah, this is not murder. Before Jews even existed ancient slaughter awaited us for thousands of years. From Masada to Munich we've been murdered. Pharaohs and popes and princes . . . called for our blood, and now we survived the war; we survived the greatest mass eradication in modern history. And we arrived home to find that the people who did this to us are our neighbors. So tell me, what should we do? Shake hands? Turn a blind eye? Forget? No. No. The greatest single gift of the Jewish people is our capacity to remember. And it's because of our memory that we know this is survival. This is not murder. This is mitzvah. We have no choice. We must instill fear. Send a message. Let them know not again. No more. No more, Jonah. Nip it in the bud. The Nazi doctor from Auschwitz, the monster in my story, still haunts me to this day. The Talmud is wrong. Living well is not the best revenge. Do you know what the best revenge is? Revenge."

At this point, the *goyim* are supposed to cheer on these Jewish thugs and hope they are not the victim of mistaken identity when the multi-culti Jewish SWAT team shows up at their door or when someone from Antifa doxes them. I'm referring here to the more widespread Jewish involvement in character assassination, not unrelated to the spread of political correctness, which has been the *modus operandi* of Jewish organizations in America for decades now. I am referring specifically to the character assassination of Catholics and conservatives which occurs whenever they incur the wrath of powerful Jews. The case of Fr. Charles Coughlin springs immediately to mind. He gave a speech following the attack on German Jews now known as *Kristallnacht*, in which he deplored the violence against the Jews but added that if Catholics were going to be held responsible for Nazism, then Jews should accept responsibility for Bolshevism.

Charles Lindbergh met a similar fate when he gave a speech in Iowa in which he claimed that the Jews and the British wanted to drag America into war. The fact that what he said was true was irrelevant. Lindbergh was punished for telling a truth which Jews found offensive, and he would serve as a paradigm for future punishments, which increased in America in direct proportion to Jewish political power and in inverse proportion to the distance from the infraction. The difference between the assassinations performed by Israeli hit squads and the character assassinations Jews perform on public figures they don't like is that the hit squad assassinations end with the death of the victim. Character assassination, on the other hand, goes on forever, or as long as Jews write books. The character assassination of Lindbergh was resurrected by Philip Roth in his novel, *The Plot Against America*, which got released in March 2020 as an HBO special. It was in many ways the sequel to *Hunters*.

We have reached an intolerable situation. Mass culture shoves one artifact after another under our noses, but open discourse about those artifacts is prohibited. As a result, any *goyische* reviewer of a series like *Hunters* or a film like Steven Spielberg's *Munich* is in a bind: If the reviewer says that Golda Meir is a cold-blooded killer who has nothing but contempt for the rule of law, he runs the danger of being called an anti-Semite. But this is precisely how Steven Spielberg portrays Meir in his movie, even if at the same time he tries to make her look as grandmotherly and sympathetic as possible.

And thus we reach the conflict that is gnawing away at Steven Spielberg and the radical incoherence at the heart of his movie. Munich is a Jewish propaganda film, but one with a bad conscience, and Steven Spielberg lacks the moral fire power to resolve his own dilemma.

According to Spielberg's moral theology, a good Jew feels remorse after he guns you down in cold blood, but a bad Jew doesn't. In other words, the only real Jew is one who is willing to commit murder in the service of Jewish

blood. The perceptive moviegoer may notice similarities between that idea and Nazism, but the rules of discourse prohibit *goyim* from mentioning this.

Moral discernment, as anyone who has seen *Saving Private Ryan* knows, was never Spielberg's strong suit. People in Spielberg movies tend to get killed because Spielberg says they are bad people, i.e., Germans in *Saving Private Ryan* or Palestinians in *Munich*. They often get killed with their hands in the air. The idea that it is never permissible to shoot a man who is standing in front of you with his hands up in the air, even if he is a German or a Palestinian, never seems to register on Spielberg's moral radar screen. Instead, morality is always a function of the group you belong to. So Spielberg inexorably gets swept up into believing that a Jew is justified in killing innocent people from any group which is perceived as threatening the future existence of either the Jewish people or the state of Israel, but once he states the idea explicitly he spends the rest of the movie wondering if what he said was really true. That is, in a nutshell, the plot of *Munich*. It can't be true that Jews can just murder anyone who is identified by the Mossad as a threat to Israel, but if that is not true, what is the movie about? Well, Spielberg doesn't know. The moral law which has been written on his heart by God has been overwritten so many times by distorted versions of Jewish ideology that he just doesn't know anymore, and so his movies are cloudy with moral ambiguity, which he tries to disguise with clever cinematography.

Munich put an end to the myth of the Jew as victim. Steven Spielberg, in other words, has put an end to the myth he helped create when he did *Schindler's List*. According to Michelle Goldberg, Spielberg's *Munich* is an elaboration on the line by Golda Meir, "We can never forgive them for making us kill their children."[4]

We live in a world where Jews are rewarded for telling lies and Catholics are punished for telling the truth. As an example of the former, we could cite the writings of Daniel Jonah Goldhagen or Elie Wiesel; as an example of the latter, we could cite the attack on Professor David O'Connell, who wrote an article exposing Wiesel's lies in *Culture Wars*. Unable to find fault with O'Connell's scholarship, the Jews who were angered by O'Connell's demolition of one of their idols decided to charge him with a non-existent literary offense. Naomi Seidman, author of one of the articles he cited, accused O'Connell in a letter to the dean and president of the university where he taught of "misappropriate[ing] Jewish Holocaust criticism."[5]

Come again? There is no such offense in the book of literary torts. Beyond that, Professor Seidman is accusing O'Connell of what she herself did in her article on Wiesel. It was she who exposed the ugly racism in the original Yiddish version of Wiesel's *Night*. It was she who was accused by other Jews of minimizing the holocaust when her article first appeared. Now she wants to punish O'Connell for quoting her. In a normal world, the administration

would have laughed Professor Seidman's complaint out of court, but we do not live in a normal world. We live in the world of Jewish discourse, where the *goyim* are punished for quoting Jews, if the Jews don't like how they are quoted.

Four years after the premier of *Munich*, Quentin Tarantino threw any and all pretense of Jewish moral agonizing to the winds in directing *Inglourious Basterds*, an orgy of revenge killing that was so over the top that Gilad Atzmon claimed that Tarantino had "managed to produce . . . 'an anti Holocaust film,'"[6] which made the Nazis look like cultured victims of Jewish barbarism. Tarantino's film, according to Gilad Atzmon's reading:

> reaches its climax when Shoshanna celebrates the opportunity to revenge the death of her family. She commits an heroic suicidal act, burning to death the entire Nazi leadership and high command who happen to gather in her small cinema to watch *Goebbels'* latest Nazi propaganda film. While the Nazis burn alive and the theatre is consumed by a blaze, with Shoshanna's face filling up the screen, laughing satanically, she is informing her Nazi burning crowd, "This is the face of Jewish vengeance." From a Jewish perspective Shoshanna's suicidal act can be realized in reference to the heroic Biblical Samson who topples the Philistine shrine on himself killing elders, women and children. In Tarantino's latest, rather than Nazis burning Jews, it is actually the Jew who locks the Nazis behind doors and burns them to death.[7]

"*Inglourious Basterds* just made me smile forever. Quentin Tarantino is righteous and every Jew should write him a thank you note. Here's mine," tweeted Sarah Silverman, the Jewish comedienne who once bragged about her willingness to kill Christ. Silverman's gratitude prompted Atzmon's dismay: "The fact that many Jews ended up praising the film may stand as another disturbing indication that the Zionist collective identity has managed to detach itself from any recognized notion of humanist reality." Atzmon thanked Tarantino too, but for bringing about the very opposite of what his movie seemingly intended. Instead of deriving "pleasure out of vengeance," Atzmon, who served in the IDF as an Israeli soldier and citizen, came to the conclusion, after "two and half hours of therapy led by Tarantino" that "Enough is Enough. No more Old Testament vengeance and barbarism. We want grace and mercy instead."

JEWISH CONSCIENCE

David Weil makes a half-hearted stab at Spielbergian moral posturing in *Hunters*, but any pretense at *gravitas* has been forever ruined by Tarantino's *Inglourious Basterds*, the Jewish affection for comic books, and the Jew's vision of himself as a comic book superhero who is simultaneously all-powerful and

always the victim. *Hunters* is a mash up of both genres, as was *Inglourious Basterds*, a movie which, according to the *Times of Israel*:

> is arguably the most famous in the Jews-killing-Nazis genre—as well as comic book culture. There are numerous comic book character jokes and references: At one point Lonny Flash, a member of the gang played by Josh Radnor, calls Jonah, who in fact works at a comic book store, a "real life f***ing Jew-perhero."

Offerman spends the entire series waging war on the conscience of Jonah Heidelbaum. After one of the many graphic and disgusting scenes of torture that disfigure this series and argue that it never should have been allowed to be made in the first place, Offerman says of the Nazi who tortured him "I could have killed him, but I didn't do anything." Regretting the missed opportunity for revenge, Offerman then badgers Jonah into swearing that he will never give in to the voice of conscience "telling me not to do something horrible when something horrible needed to be done." Because Offerman "hesitated once and it was the greatest mistake I ever made," he demands that Jonah, "Swear to me you will not let what is inside [i.e., your conscience] prevent you from doing what is difficult [i.e., commit murder]."

The issue is suppression of conscience. To be a good Jew, Jonah has to suppress the voice of conscience which communicates the moral law which God has written on his heart. To become a good Jew, in other words, Jonah has to become a bad human being. This is the message of *Munich*, *Inglourious Basterds*, and *Hunters*. Whenever this disturbing thought intrudes, Weil switches to comic relief, which isn't funny, or sentimental portrayals of Jewish life, which are unconvincing because of what Offerman advocates throughout the entire series. Warm-hearted scenes of the aged Al Pacino hopping around the synagogue dance floor to "Hava Nagila" do nothing to ameliorate the fundamental inhumanity of Meyer Offerman's world view. This fundamental penchant of the Jewish mind to revenge inspired Gilad Atzmon to invoke Christianity when he cried: "Enough is enough. No more Old Testament vengeance and barbarism. We want grace and mercy instead." But Leviticus contradicts Meyer Offerman as well: "You must not bear hatred for your brother in your heart. You must openly tell him, your neighbor, of his offense; this way you will not take a sin upon yourself. You must not exact vengeance. . . ." (Lev. 19:19).

Like *Inglourious Basterds*, *Hunters* brings about the opposite of what its director intends. In spite of the sentimental evocation of all of the usual holocaust tropes, Jewish suffering gets first cheapened and then rendered ridiculous. As one preposterous fabrication follows on the heels of another, we find ourselves wondering if real Jewish suffering hasn't always been instrumentalized as a launching pad for fictions created for political purposes. Did the Nazis make lampshades out of the skin of Jews, as I was told in my

youth? Doesn't Weil's chessboard fit into the same category as the lampshades and the soap that no one talks about anymore? Similarly, was Elie Wiesel liberated from Buchenwald or was it Auschwitz? And why was David O'Connell almost fired for raising this and other pertinent questions?

Hunters is simultaneously the culmination of Holocaust porn, its *reductio ad absurdum*, and its refutation, which is why the Auschwitz Memorial chided Weil for creating his fictitious human chess board. "Auschwitz was full of horrible pain & suffering documented in the accounts of survivors," the Auschwitz Memorial said on Twitter. "Inventing a fake game of human chess for @huntersonprime is not only dangerous foolishness & caricature. It also welcomes future deniers. We honor the victims by preserving factual accuracy."[8] Creator David Weil said in reply that "it was an intentional choice to portray a fictionalized view of Auschwitz."

The by now famous Auschwitz orchestra comes in for similar comic book exaggeration. In one of *Hunters*' unintentionally funny moments, Weil honors the memory of anyone who had to suffer through a Jewish wedding or bar mitzvah by having a fat Nazi prison guard shoot every musician in the Auschwitz orchestra for playing "Hava Nagila," a song which was made famous by Harry Belafonte, who claimed that "Most Jews in America learned that song from me," and was covered by artists as diverse as Chubby Checker and Bob Dylan.[9] Spielberg had better taste in music when he chose John Williams to write the music score for *Schindler's List.*

COMPROMISED CATHOLICS

Realizing that he can't accomplish this much mayhem alone, Offerman goes to a Jewish matchmaker, who is tasked with assembling the multi-culti SWAT team that will bring these Nazis to justice, as the Jews define that term. As we all know from watching television and Hollywood movies, every Jewish SWAT team has to have at least two Negroes on board, to distract us from the Jewish racism which lies at the core of their Nazi hunting. The presence of Negroes serves other purposes as well, like distracting us from the disturbing fact that in New York, the *mise en scene* of *Hunters*, the most likely group to perpetrate violence against Jews is Blacks. Rounding out our multi-culti SWAT team we have a comedian from the Catskills, an Asian, and, of course, a Catholic nun in habit who smokes cigarettes, packs two pistols, and, like everyone else in the film, says "Fuck" a lot.

This brings up *Hunters*' weird relationship to the Catholic Church. The Black female FBI agent who has been tasked with discovering who killed the female Nazi rocket scientist who was gassed in her shower stall in Cape Canaveral is also a Catholic. We know this because of a scene in which she settles into a pew in a Catholic church, takes out her rosary, and proceeds to recite the Apostles' Creed. When the Black FBI agent arrives home, she

engages in lesbian sex with another younger Black woman, who for all we know might be a Catholic too. Don't all pious Catholic women engage in lesbian sex after reciting the rosary? Actually, it turns out that the younger Black lesbian is a Catholic too. We know this because the parish priest paid them a visit and blessed the house and presented them with a crucifix as a reminder of their good standing in the Church. "He's totally on board with it," the younger lesbian tells the Black FBI agent, "Why aren't you?" Weil portrays the Catholic Church as sexually compromised, and therefore incapable of rendering any critique of the sort that the Church proposed when the Jews were considered enemies. The truth behind Weil's fiction is that the Catholic Church has been co-opted by more than 50 years of Catholic-Jewish "dialogue." As a result, Catholics have become the Jews' proxy warriors.

And what is the point of all of the improbable fictions that make up the multi-culti SWAT team? It is to convince the Jews that their project of homicidal revenge killings has widespread support from all of the right kind of people, which is to say everyone who is not white, because white is synonymous with racism and murder, both of which are bad, unless practiced by Jews, in which case murder, as Al Pacino says, becomes a "mitzvah." After convincing Jonah to drown whatever scruples he might have about committing murder, Meyer Offerman tells him and Foxy Brown, and the Chinaman, and the chain-smoking nun that it's time to get to work: "We have trials ahead. A growing list of vermin. So let us get to cooking these Nazi cunts."

JOSEPH I. BREEN

If anyone has been offended by the language thus far, I should point out that this film never would have gotten made under the Production Code which Catholics imposed on Hollywood's Jews in 1933. The Legion of Decency boycott had brought Warner Brothers to its knees. With financial ruin staring them in the face, Hollywood's Jews reluctantly agreed to clean up their act. Joseph I. Breen, who enforced that code had no illusions about the Hollywood elite which he personally prevented from making films like *Hunters*. It is worth quoting his insight again:

> They are simply a rotten bunch of vile people with no respect for anything beyond the making of money . . . Here [in Hollywood] we have Paganism rampant and in its most virulent form. Drunkenness and debauchery are commonplace. Sexual perversion is rampant . . . . any number of our directors and stars are perverts. . . . The Jews seem to think of nothing but moneymaking and sexual indulgence. The vilest kind of sin is a common indulgence hereabouts and the men and women who engage in this sort of business are the men and women who decide what the film fare of the nation is to be. They and they alone make the decision. Ninety-five

> percent of these folks are Jews of an Eastern European lineage. They are probably the scum of the earth.[10]

Was Joe Breen an anti-Semite? The fact that five of the six pallbearers at Breen's funeral were Jewish indicates that he wasn't, but it was also an indication that he could handle Jews and their tendency toward obscenity and blasphemy in a way that earned their respect. Breen was adamant in his belief that the movie fare of the United States should not be put into the hands of people like this, and said so in a frank letter he wrote to Daniel Lord, SJ. For 30 years, Catholics like Joe Breen prevailed over the Jews' baser instincts, but in 1965 shortly after the close of the Second Vatican Council and the promulgation of *Nostra Aetate*, Hollywood used the Holocaust to smuggle bare breasts onto the silver screen in *The Pawnbroker*, which inaugurated the genre of Holocaust porn. *Schindler's List*, the next major example of the holocaust porn genre, made generous use of the nudity which *The Pawnbroker* introduced, and got a pass on the laws restricting that sort of thing when it got rebroadcast on network television, something Howard Stern noticed to his annoyance since his penchant for blasphemy and obscenity was limited to satellite radio at the time.

The Catholic Church lost the Culture Wars when it failed to block pornography in 1965. Soon hard-core porn films were being shown in first run theaters, and Jewish power over the culture increased accordingly. Why don't the Catholic bishops ask the Jews to do something about pornography? Are they afraid they would be guilty of anti-Semitism simply by raising the question? They'd probably accuse themselves of anti-Semitism for even entertaining the thought that "Everyone knows that the Porn Industry is run by the Jews."[11]

THE ADULT FILM INDUSTRY

In 2003, when I made this claim in an article entitled "Rabbi Dresner's Dilemma," I was denounced as an anti-Semite. One year later, Professor Nathan Abrams reworked my article in The Jewish Quarterly.[12] He was not denounced as an anti-Semite even though the gist of both articles was identical. The difference was world view. I condemned pornography; Abrams' view is best summarized best by the subhead: "What are we ashamed of?" According to Professor Abrams:

> there's no getting away from the fact that secular Jews have played (and still continue to play) a disproportionate role throughout the adult film industry in America. Jewish involvement in pornography has a long history in the United States, as Jews have helped to transform a fringe subculture into what has become a primary constituent of Americana. These are the 'true blue Jews.'

Citing me, Abrams concludes that there is a "deeper reason, beyond the mere financial as to why Jews in particular have become involved in porn": "Jewish involvement in porn, by this argument, is the result of an atavistic hatred of Christian authority: they are trying to weaken the dominant culture in America by moral subversion."

Nudity, obscenity, blasphemy, and foul language have been part of the Jewish toolkit for cultural destruction ever since the collapse of the Legion of Decency, and *Hunters* takes that tradition to new depths. All of the things Joe Breen found repugnant about Jewish filmmaking are now being harnessed in films like *Hunters*, not to break down standards that have long since passed by the wayside, but to re-impose a form of social control that the masses are now beginning to abandon. When millennials organized a boycott of pornography in November 2019, *Rolling Stone* magazine accused them of anti-Semitism.[13] In order to demonize any group which opts out of the Jewish system of sexual liberation as political control, Hollywood has to demonize them as Nazis, which is why *Hunters* was set in 1977, the year Simon Wiesenthal embarked on his Nazi-hunting career.

THE NAZIS ARE DEAD

Having lived in Germany during the middle part of the 1970s and having talked with a number of German men who had served in the *Wehrmacht*, all of whom were old enough to be my father, I can say with some degree of certainty that Nazism was not the issue at that time. One of the most important events which took place in 1977 occurred when the terrorist Baader-Meinhof gang in collaboration with El Fatah, the radical Palestinian group, hijacked the Lufthansa plane Landshut and flew it to Mogadishu, where Binyamin Netanyahu's elder brother died in the rescue attempt. The Left was ready to implode, and its program of Marxist economic revolution would be replaced in that year by Michel Foucault's pact with the devil: give us sexual liberation and we won't criticize your economic system. Foucault ended up teaching Austrian school economics at Berkeley, and that led to the Reagan-Thatcher era, but Nazism or its neo-Nazi variant was nowhere to be seen, other than in the minds of Jews like Wiesenthal, who were obsessed with revenge as a way of keeping the Holocaust narrative alive.

In 2020 there are even fewer, if any, Nazis still alive, leading us to the question, "Why this film now?" The answer is loss of control. The Jews lost control of the narrative in 2019, and *Hunters* is their way of getting it back, by asking deep moral questions like "Is it moral to kill Nazis?" The answer seems to be yes. Jews can kill someone they identify as a Nazi on their own without any recourse to a jury trial or the rest of the legal system they use to destroy their enemies, as Roberta Kaplan, the self-described "chubby lesbian kike," uses it to destroy the lives of white boys in the wake of Charlottesville.

But if the Nazis are all dead, who is left to take their place? The answer is anti-Semites. The message of *Hunters*, which purports to talk about killing Nazis in 1977, is that it is okay to kill anti-Semites in 2020. And how can we recognize anti-Semites? Well, they are, to begin with, all white and all over the age of 50. Unlike the real situation in 2019, where violence against Jews got perpetrated by Blacks in New York City, Jews are justified in hating whites because all whites are racist anti-Semites. If you need further, more specific information about who exactly is an anti-Semite, you can go to the website of the Anti-Defamation League, where you will find my name. Or you can consult Dr. Michael Brown, who held me responsible for the shootings at the synagogue in Poway, California. *Hunters*, in other words, is a deliberate incitement to violence against people like me. Does criticizing Jews encourage people to pick up guns? Or do movies about Jewish vigilantes like *Hunters* encourage violence?

After watching *Hunters*, I was relieved to read the statement which Bishop Kevin Rhoades, Ordinary of the Diocese of Fort Wayne-South Bend, issued on February 19, 2020 informing Catholics that "The Jews are not our enemies." It's nice to know that "Those who speak of Jews as our enemies are mistaken."[14] But did the Nazi hunters know that? With friends like Meyer Offerman, who needs enemies?

BISHOP KEVIN C. RHOADES

Bishop Rhoades was inspired to write his statement after attending a "Violins of Hope" inter-faith prayer service at St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Church in Fort Wayne, Indiana, celebrating the arrival of "violins that were played by Jewish prisoners at concentration camps during the Holocaust." Listening to those violins brought tears "of both sadness and joy" to Bishop Rhoades' eyes. He felt "joy at the love we share as brothers and sisters, drawn together by a common spiritual patrimony" but sadness at the "rise in recent years of anti-Jewish and anti-Semitic rhetoric in our society," as well as "incidents of violence incited by hateful speech about Jews."[15]

At this point, Rhoades left the world of Catholic theology and disappeared into the realm of Holocaust causality, which takes categories of reality and associates them with confected categories of the mind which attribute violence against Jews to "hateful speech" and not Jewish behavior, a conclusion that needs to be demonstrated rather than assumed as already proven. Was it rhetoric that caused Blacks to attack Jews in Brooklyn and Jersey City? Or was it the behavior of Jewish landlords?

Similar questions could be raised about the Holocaust itself. Was the cause "hateful speech"? Or was it Jewish behavior, specifically the perception among Germans and Catholic observers like Eugenio Pacelli, then nuncio to Germany and later Pope Pius XII, that Jewish participation in the Communist

takeover of cities like Berlin and Munich in the aftermath of Germany's defeat in World War I posed a threat to Germany's existence as a nation? I was relieved to learn that "Language that incites animosity is harmful." But did that claim apply equally to Jews and Christians? If so, why didn't the bishop mention *Hunters*, which was nothing but hours-long incitement to animosity and physical violence against Catholics if they happened to be perceived as white or anti-Semitic?

Rhoades' novel use of the term "anti-Judaism" similarly raised more questions than it answered. The Church has always condemned forms of racial discrimination like anti-Semitism, which Pius XI explicitly condemned in *Mit Brennender Sorge*, but she could not condemn anti-Judaism without condemning the Gospels, the Acts of the Apostles, the Epistles of St. Paul, and the writings of the Church Fathers, because all of the seminal writings of the Catholic Church are firm in their opposition to what was calling itself Judaism at that time. After making the claim that "Jews are not our enemies," Rhoades says:

> We are bound together with them in friendship as brothers and sisters in the family of God. In the synagogue of Rome in 2016, Pope Francis spoke of the spiritual bond between Jews and Christians and the importance of fostering an authentic friendship. He said: "In interreligious dialogue it is fundamental that we encounter each other as brothers and sisters before our Creator and that we praise him: and that we respect and appreciate each other and try to cooperate." This is especially important as the Church and the Jewish communities continue to address religious and ethical questions that both face in a world intent upon challenging religious freedom. Jews and Christians can impact society profoundly when they stand together on key issues such as the sanctity of human life, immigration reform, health care, human trafficking and world peace.[16]

LITTLE SISTERS OF THE POOR

This passage brought a wry smile to my face because I was in the same room with Bishop Rhoades when he tried to float the idea of shared commitment to religious freedom to the Jewish Federation of St. Joseph County. When, I was tempted to ask, did Jews and Christians ever "stand together on key issues such as the sanctity of human life, immigration reform, health care, human trafficking and world peace"? Not on that day, for sure. After the Obama Administration was refusing religious exemption to the demand that the Little Sisters of the Poor provide contraceptives to their employees and Bishop Rhoades addressed the Jewish Federation of St. Joseph County asking for their support, not one Jewish organization would support religious freedom if that meant impeding access to either abortion or government-mandated funding of abortion. The only reason that the Church is no longer faced with

this issue is the election of Donald Trump. In the 50-some years since the promulgation of *Nostra Aetate*, Jewish organizations have been at the forefront of promoting abortion, gay marriage, and other social pathologies. Catholic convert Bernard Nathanson, one of two Jews responsible for overturning the law banning abortion in New York State before his conversion, felt that the Catholic Church missed an opportunity to stop abortion by not portraying it as the anti-American "spawn of a cadre of wild-eye Jewish radicals in New York City."[17] Nathanson failed to understand that the bishops' misreading of *Nostra Aetate* and commitment to Catholic-Jewish dialogue prohibited mentioning Jewish responsibility for anything bad.

DIOCESE OF HARRISBURG

Three days before the release of *Hunters* on Amazon Prime, Amazon informed me that the Fidelity Press e-book on "The Jewish Question" violated its hate speech standards and that it was being removed from their list of e-books. *The Jewish Question* was the translation into English of a three-part series on that topic which had appeared in *Civiltà Cattolica*, the official magazine of the Vatican, over the fall of 1890. Amazon was now in the business of determining what was and was not authentically Catholic, and there was no court of appeal.

The *Civiltà Cattolica* articles came at the end of a long line of pronouncements by Church officials which would not be considered anti-Semitic. In 1569, Saint Pius V, issued the Bull *Hebraeorum gens* ("The Jewish Race") which expelled Jews from some of the Papal states, and began with these words:

> The Jewish people fell from the heights because of their faithlessness and condemned their Redeemer to a shameful death. Their godlessness has assumed such forms that, for the salvation of our own people, it becomes necessary to prevent their disease. Besides usury, through which Jews everywhere have sucked dry the property of impoverished Christians, they are accomplices of thieves and robbers; and the most damaging aspect of the matter is that they allure the unsuspecting through magical incantations, superstition, and witchcraft to the Synagogue of Satan and boast of being able to predict the future. We have carefully investigated how this revolting sect abuses the name of Christ and how harmful they are to those whose life is threatened by their deceit. On account of these and other serious matters, and because of the gravity of their crimes which increase day to day more and more, We order that, within 90 days, all Jews in our entire earthly realm of justice – in all towns, districts, and places – must depart these regions.

Either the pope's statement is anti-Semitic or the policy which eminated from Vatican II claiming that Jews are our friends is misguided. *Non datur tertium* There is no third option.

On virtually the same day on which Bishop Rhoades announced that Jews are not our enemies, the diocese of Harrisburg, Rhoades' former diocese, filed for bankruptcy after succumbing to a slew of lawsuits inspired by Pennsylvania's Jewish attorney general, who published the dossiers and pictures of 300 priests who were accused of sexual abuse, but handed down only one indictment. As I said before, with friends like this Catholics need no enemies.

Jesus Christ said that we should love our enemies; he never said that the Catholic Church would have no enemies, or, worse still, that the Church should pretend that she had no enemies. In spite of the fact that he describes the Jews as "the chosen people" and "still loved by God," St. Paul called them "enemies of God only with regard to the Good News, and enemies only for your sake" (Romans, 11:28). In a gloss on this passage, Robert Sungenis writes:

> Dealing with the first view, Paul says the Jews are enemies with respect to the Gospel. Why? Obviously because the Jews oppose the Christian Gospel. They reject Jesus Christ as the Son of God and Savior of the world. They believe he was a false prophet, an imposter, a charlatan who tried to make himself something he wasn't and as a result he deserved the death he suffered on the cross. With few exceptions, this was the attitude of the Jews in Paul's day, and it continues throughout the Middle Ages and right up to the present time. For the Gentiles, the Jews' rejection of Christ and Christianity turned out (*i.e.*, "on your account") to be beneficial since it allowed the Gentiles to receive the Gospel and become saved.[18]

In keeping with the idea that Jews are our friends, Bishop Rhoades attempted to exonerate them from responsibility for the death of Christ: "Very importantly, the Second Vatican Council rejected the accusation that Jews were 'Christ-killers,' a charge that through the centuries resulted in anti-Jewish hatred and persecution." Rhoades cites this passage from *Nostra Aetate* to back up his assertion: "Even though the Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ (cf. John 19:6), neither all Jews indiscriminately at that time, nor Jews today, can be charged with the crimes committed during his passion" (*NA* 4).

So unless I am missing something, the Second Vatican Council said that "Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ." If we put Jewish leaders together with Jewish followers, we come up with a group known as the Jewish people, and this is the group which claimed formal responsibility for the death of Christ when they cried, "His blood be on us and our children" (Matt: 27:26).

But does telling Jews that they killed Christ lead to "anti-Jewish hatred and persecution"? If we read the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles, it seems to

have the opposite effect. When Peter emerged from hiding after Pentecost, the Holy Spirit inspired him to address the Jews he previously feared:

> Men of Israel, listen to what I am going to say. Jesus the Nazarene was a man commended to you by God by the miracles and portents and signs that God worked through him when he was among you, as you all know. This man, who was put into your power by the deliberate intention and foreknowledge of God, you took and had crucified by men outside the Law. You killed him . . .

So it turns out that Jews are Christ-killers after all. "But God raised Him to life. . . . For this reason the Whole House of Israel can be certain that God has made this Jesus whom you crucified both Lord and Christ." When the Jews heard this "they were cut to the heart and said to Peter and the Apostles, "What must we do, brothers" and Peter answered, "You must repent and every one of you must be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ."

If Peter had not told the Jews that they had killed Christ, they would not have been "cut to the heart," and if they had not been cut to the heart, they would not have sought baptism, and if they had not been baptized, they could not have been saved. And so if the successor of Peter goes to Jerusalem but does not tell the Jews that they killed Christ, he is collaborating in their damnation.

Does that mean that every Jew in Jerusalem at the time of the Passion called for Christ's death? Well, no. The Blessed Mother never shouted "Crucify him." Nor did St. John, who also stood at the foot of the Cross. So if we put these pieces together, it turns out that the Jews who rejected Christ were responsible for his death, and the Jews who accepted him as the Messiah, otherwise known as the Catholic Church or the New Israel, were not.

Having exonerated the Jews, Rhoades goes on to make "sinners" responsible for Christ's death. Citing the *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, Rhoades writes: "In her Magisterial teaching of the faith and in the witness of her saints, the Church has never forgotten that 'sinners were the authors and the ministers of all the sufferings that the divine Redeemer endured'" (*NA* 4). This is, of course, true, but it doesn't exonerate the Jews unless His Excellency is willing to claim that no Jew is a sinner. Bishop Rhoades concludes his statement by saying:

> In this age of social media, people read or listen to all kinds of opinions expressed about Judaism and the Jewish people on internet blogs, websites, and the like. Some are filled with false and hateful rhetoric, opposed to the very spirit of Christianity. As Catholics, we must reject any that express, or can lead to, contempt for Jews. It is important that Catholics embrace and follow the message of *Nostra Aetate*, the authoritative, Conciliar teaching of the Church.

Just to set the record straight, I do accept *Nostra Aetate* as "the authoritative, Conciliar teaching of the Church," because *Nostra Aetate* said "the Jewish authorities and those who followed their lead pressed for the death of Christ" not because it said the opposite.

My name did not appear in Bishop Rhoades's statement. In a *Catholic News Agency* article published on February 25, 2020, we read that "Bishop Rhoades did not mention specific incidents or personalities,"[19] but that didn't deter Dexter Van Zile from claiming the opposite. On the same day in which Bishop Rhoades' statement appeared in *Today's Catholic*, Van Zile's article taking credit for the statement began circulating through Jewish/Israeli outlets like *Israelhayom*, "a newspaper published by far-right billionaire Sheldon Adelson,"[20] which quoted Van Zile as saying Rhoades' statement was a "thoroughgoing rebuke to the Jew-hatred promoted by E. Michael Jones, who lives in the diocese Bishop Rhoades serves."[21]

EL CONVERSO VAN ZILE

Van Zile works for an Israeli propaganda outlet called The Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America (CAMERA), a "vocal and well-funded" organ of the Israel Lobby, whose "employees harangue journalists and human rights defenders in the name of 'promoting accurate and balanced coverage of Israel and the Middle East.'"[22]

Van Zile began his journalistic career by subjecting the president of the university he attended in the 1980s to "undeserved . . . calumny" while writing for the campus newspaper. He then graduated to being a "fishing reporter,"[23] but his ties to the Gatestone Institute, a "far-right think tank" which specializes in "publishing false or inaccurate articles" about Muslims, and his association with people like John Bolton and Daniel Pipes at Gatestone is more relevant to his work at CAMERA than whatever he wrote about fish, and closely connected to the habit of calumny he developed as an undergraduate, when it comes to people like me.[24]

Van Zile's calumny campaign had been going on for some time before the release of *Hunters*, but it was part of the same Jewish-led campaign that brought violins from Auschwitz to Fort Wayne and tried to get me banned from social media platforms like YouTube by the ADL. In August of 2019, Dexter Van Zile wrote a letter demanding that Bishop Rhoades denounce me. Rhoades ignored his letter, leading Van Zile to post it as an open letter on the Internet. When Rhoades ignored the on-line version of his letter as well, Van Zile's attack on me got picked up by Jewish converts like Rachel Bratten Weiss, who posted links to Van Zile's letter and attacks of their own like "Know Your Dogwhistles! Recognizing Anti-Semitism Is the First Step,"[25] which appeared on January 20, 2020. In that piece, Weiss wrote:

> I have written before about how there is an antisemitism problem among Catholics of the far right. Whether it's alt-right media personality Patrick Coffin giving a platform to overt antisemites such as E. Michael Jones, or Center for Family and Human Rights president Austin Ruse praising the Proud Boys, or white nationalist John Zmirak defending the phrase "you will not replace us – whether it's tabloid media groups such as the Remnant publishing anti-semitic material – whether it's ongoing and concerted online attacks on Catholics of Jewish ethnicity, by shadowy accounts juxtaposing religious iconography with Pepe the Frog and other alt-right images – well, it's clear we have a problem.[26]

Yes, we have a problem. Over the past 15 years a number of Jews have converted to the Catholic faith without any attempt to reform the bad habits they acquired during their former lives as Jews. Foremost among these faults is a reckless willingness to attack fellow Catholics as anti-Semites whenever they disagree with the ADL party line. When Bratten Weiss's fellow convert from Judaism Dawn Goldstein attacked me as an anti-Semite on Twitter,27 I tried to reach out to her by tweeting "Accusing fellow Catholics of anti-Semitism is a sin against charity."[28] My effort got me blocked from her Twitter account, where she continued her Jihad against me.[29]

These attacks by Jewish converts have in common a refusal to define the term anti-Semitism combined with an even firmer refusal to quote anything I have actually written or said. Instead of citing something I've written, Bratten Weiss accuses me of using a "dogwhistle," which is:

> a seemingly harmless phrase that is intended to convey racial prejudice to others "in the know." This is how racists and anti-semites manage to communicate with one another in plain sight. This is also how they manage to recruit the naive – or, at least, get the naive to defend them. Especially if the dogwhistles are connected with noble-sounding language about honor or family or community, it looks as though we Jews are just getting hysterical over nothing, attacking decent people. Because that's another way racists and anti-semites function to achieve influence: by being "nice people."

I'm perfectly willing to admit that I'm not a nice person, but she should at least have quoted one thing I actually wrote, or even my ADL profile, which asserts that I am not a racist. Instead, she cited Van Zile's hit piece, which then circulated among websites frequented by Jewish converts, who contributed to the pressure which Van Zile, who was calling the chancery office every other day, put on Bishop Rhoades to condemn me.

Is there a pattern emerging here? I think there is. We are now in the midst of what might be termed a neoconverso crisis, which began in earnest around 15 years ago with the publication of Roy Shoeman's book *Salvation is from the Jews*, which I reviewed favorably. My contact with it goes back farther than

that. I met David Moss, head of the Association of Hebrew Catholics, the center of neoconversoism, in what must have been the mid-1980s at Chauncey Stillman's country estate in the Catskills. Moss had founded the Association of Hebrew Catholics based on the writings of Elias Friedman, who wanted to establish a Hebrew Catholic Rite. Jewish converts I knew at the time like Fr. Arthur Klyber and Mark Drogin, of the St. Martin de Porres Community in New Hope, Kentucky found the idea of a separate Jewish identity within the Church repugnant, but after Fr. Klyber's death Drogin eventually became a supporter of Moss's idea of Jewish identity within the Catholic Church. When theologian Ray Kevane, the man Moss had asked to be his group's theological advisor, objected to their bad theology and ethnocentrism, they ignored him, forcing him to publish his objections as an open letter in *Culture Wars*.[30]

In one of his earliest writings, *Der Juden Spiegel* (Mirror of the Jews) published in Cologne in 1507, Josef Pfefferkorn, a Moravian Jew who converted to Christianity three years earlier, gives a candid description of his conversion and, by implication, the life he lived before that event. "I was born in the Jewish faith and am now, by the grace of God, a Christian."[31] He indicates that he lived by usury before his conversion but that he gave it up when he became a Christian because usury, which he rails against *in extenso* in other works, is immoral. "If I continued to associate with Jews," he continued, "and continued to take usury, what would you say other than that I was in serious sin and that I never really became a Christian, and everyone would condemn me by saying that the blood and suffering of Christ had been lost on me. What help would the holy sacrament of baptism have been to me?"[32]

So it's possible for a Jew to convert and yet not become fully Christian. Pfefferkorn lists two disqualifying conditions: continued practice of usury and continued association with Jews. This continued association with Jews and, more importantly, bad Jewish ideas brought Kevane to the point where he had to condemn the organization Moss had asked him to advise. The straw that broke the camel's back came when Moss announced on EWTN in March 2005 that he rejected the idea that the Church was the New Israel and had replaced the old covenant.[33] Making matters worse, Moss went on to say that the Church had taught the erroneous theology of supersessionism for 2,000 years. "No Catholic can say that the Church has taught an erroneous theology for 2,000 years and remain a Catholic," said Kevane.[34] The AHC studiously ignored what Kevane said and turned instead to then Bishop Raymond Burke, who endorsed the AHC in a video they made in lieu of responding to Kevane. The door was now opened to Jewish converts bringing their previous religious identity and bad habits into the Church with them. The main idea that bound the Jewish converts which Van Zile mobilized against me together was their belief that the Church was riddled with anti-Semites.

Van Zile would probably still be calling the chancery office demanding a statement if I hadn't published the picture of Bishop Rhoades, my wife

and me, taken after the Mass at St. Matthew's Cathedral in South Bend celebrating our 50th wedding anniversary. I published the picture at the end of my article on "Sam Francis and the Triple Melting Pot,"[35] not as proof that Bishop Rhoades endorsed my ideas, but rather as proof that Catholics, unlike white nationalists, had an objective ethnic identity based on religion and, therefore, protection against what I was calling "identity theft":

> unlike "Conservatism" or "whiteness" or any other confected identity, Catholicism confers an identity through baptism which cannot be taken away from its members by the self-appointed popes who, as recipients of oligarchic money, police the precincts of identity politics. Sam Francis was excommunicated from the synagogue known as conservatism by William F. Buckley, who with the help of Jewish money, had had himself named pope of that sect. The fact that the same thing didn't happen to me at the hands of Dexter Van Zile is proof of my contention that the Catholic faith is a category which exists in the mind of God. As such, it cannot be contradicted by men. It guarantees protection from the predations of Satan and his synagogue on earth that no other identity can provide.[36]

The situation changed not so much because of what I said in the Sam Francis article, but because I published a picture of Bishop Rhoades standing between my wife and me which was taken at the diocesan celebration of our 50th wedding anniversary. Seeing his opportunity, Van Zile redoubled his efforts by contacting the network of Jewish converts that formed a *de facto* fifth column within the Church. Fearing guilt by association, Rhoades caved into Van Zile's pressure. This is not the way this is supposed to happen. Jesus tells us, "If your brother does something wrong, go and have it out with him alone, between your two selves. If he listens to you, you have won back your brother. If he does not listen, take one or two others along with you: the evidence of two or three witnesses is required to sustain any charge. But if he refuses to listen to these, report it to the community; and if he refuses to listen to the community, treat him like a pagan or tax collector" (Matt 18:15-17).

IS CRITICISM A SIN?

The Bible gives clear instructions about fraternal correction, but the bishop didn't follow them. If the bishop had mentioned me by name, he would have had to cite something that I had actually said or written. Instead, what could have been a fruitful dialogue disappeared into a fatal conflation of manners and morals, in which Catholics are harangued for not accepting "human regulations," i.e., Jewish taboos against hate speech, as if they were the word of God. In *Lumen Gentium*, the Second Vatican Council's document on the Church, we read "the faithful, for their part, are obliged to submit to their bishops' decision, made in the name of Christ, in matters of faith and morals,

and to adhere to it with a ready and respectful allegiance of mind."[37] As I said, I accept the documents of Vatican II as part of the ordinary magisterium of the Catholic Church. I also accept the authority of the local bishop. Admitting that, what am I to make of the claim that "the Catholic Church offers no shelter to anti-Jewish bias, regardless of its content or expression. This applies to racist statements against Jews, to anti-Semitism, or to any religious opinion that denigrates Jews or Judaism"? What exactly does Bishop Rhoades mean when he refers to "anti-Jewish bias, regardless of its content or expression"? Is he talking about manners or morals here? If he's talking about morals then I have to submit to his judgment, but I can't submit to something that I don't understand, and so I have to ask, is it a sin to criticize Jews? If it is a sin, point out which commandment I have broken. If it is a matter of bad manners, that does not rise to the level of comment much less condemnation in a Church document.

To be more precise, an anti-Semite, as the term is now used, refers to someone who criticizes Jews. Acquiescence to this usage would deny Catholics the right to criticize Jews under pain of being deemed an anti-Semite. Is it anti-Semitic to criticize Jews? If so, Moses was an anti-Semite. Is it anti-Semitic to refer to Jews as children of Satan? If so, Jesus was an anti-Semite. And if anti-Semitism is a sin, Jesus committed a sin, which means he was not perfect, which means he was not God. Jews may not be criticized, no matter what they do, whether it is killing innocent Palestinian women or children with their air strikes or promoting moral subversion under the guise of "marriage equality" or "reproductive rights."

I can understand why "racist statements against Jews" are wrong. Anti-Semitism is wrong because it is based on a false racial understanding of the Jewish identity, but what about "any opinion that denigrates Jews or Judaism"? Doesn't Jesus Christ denigrate Jews when he tells them "the devil is your father" (John 8:44)? Doesn't Jesus call Jews liars? Isn't the whole Gospel of St. John one long denigration of Jews and Judaism? The Jews certainly think so. Micha Brumlik got to the heart of the issue when he said that the "irreducible Kernel" of the Gospel of St. John is "intrinsically anti-Jewish" and "an embassy of hate." If the Gospel of St. John is normative for Christianity, according to Brumlik's reasoning, then Christianity is a religion of hate and there is no point in engaging in dialogue with its adherents. Brumlik engages in dialogue but only to denounce the fundamental writings of Christianity as hate speech because "there is no other scripture in which the marginalization of Jews, and by that I mean Judaism, is achieved in such a sharp, irreconcilable and unbridgeable manner as in the Gospel according to John."[38] The Jews, as St. John and Micha Brumlik use the term, aren't Judeans or Pharisees or other groups opposing the followers of Jesus; they are the Jewish people. The "Divine Word" of the Christians was a Jew, but that doesn't change the fundamentally anti-Jewish nature of the Gospel. Brumlik concludes that dialogue between

Christians and Jews is impossible if either takes the Gospel of St. John as its starting point. There is no possible meeting point because Jesus is the essence of Christianity and that essence is "precisely what Jews, insofar as they want to remain Jews, must reject."[39]

AN ANTI-JEWISH GOSPEL

Is the Gospel of St. John anti-Semitic? No, of course not. All of the protagonists in the drama that divided the Jewish people shared the same DNA. Jesus Christ condemned the idea of sacred DNA when the Jews claimed to be "the seed of Abraham" and Jesus rejected that claim. Is the Gospel of St. John anti-Jewish? I think we would all have to agree with Micha Brumlik and admit that it is. Since the Gospel of St. John is one of the normative documents of the Catholic Faith, we have to conclude that Catholics must be likewise anti-Jewish, as St. John defines the term.

As things stand now, Bishop Rhoades has handed a blank check with his signature on it to the character assassins employed by Israeli propaganda outlets like CAMERA, who can now say whatever they want about me and any other Catholic who objects to Jewish participation in moral subversion and claim that it has the endorsement of the Catholic Church. But, as I say to my children, this isn't about me. This is about clarifying a problem that has plagued the Church since the close of the Second Vatican Council. If Bishop Rhoades is speaking "in the name of Christ, in matters of faith and morals" in his letter, then he needs to answer a simple but important question: Is it a sin to criticize Jews? To get more specific, is it a sin to write a review of the Amazon Prime series *Hunters*? I could not write that review without mentioning Jews, nor could I write it in good conscience without condemning the morally repugnant, specifically Jewish world view which that film proposes. Since the faithful are "obliged to submit to their bishops' decision, made in the name of Christ in matters of faith and morals," I need to know if I committed a sin. This is not simply a personal matter because the views which Bishop Rhoades expressed in his letter are most probably shared by the majority of his fellow bishops in the United States, if not the world. That fact, however, does not exclude error, as discussed at length in chapter sixteen of this volume, Catholic-Jewish Dialogue: The Gift that Keeps Giving.

WEAKENED RESOLVE

The same dialogue that has weakened the resolve of Catholics has led to no concessions on the part of the Jews or the Jewish-controlled press. If anything, that press has become more virulently anti-Catholic in response to what they perceive as Catholic weakness. Even the bishops, the main apologists for the failed experiment known as Catholic-Jewish dialogue, have started to take notice. Archbishop Timothy Dolan tried to explain the Catholic-Jewish

double standard in an op-ed piece he sent to the *New York Times*, which the *Times* refused to publish. When it comes to sexual abuse, the Catholic Church got subjected to a "scurrilous . . . diatribe" by Maureen Dowd "that rightly never would have passed muster with the editors had it so criticized an Islamic, Jewish or African-American" faith,[40] but when the *New York Times* "exposed the sad extent of child sexual abuses in Brooklyn's Orthodox Jewish Community . . . forty cases of such abuses in this tiny community last year alone," wrote the archbishop, "the district attorney swept the scandal under the rug, and the *Times* held up the carpet."[41]

The American bishops' repudiation of Cardinal Keeler's "Reflections on Covenant and Mission" was more than just a stunning reversal of 50 years of bad theology. It had global implications as well, implications which became clear when the *Jerusalem Post* ran an article on "why Israel is losing the PR war." According to the *Jerusalem Post*, the main reason for the precipitous drop in Israel's approval rating (from 70 to 40 percent) is the "resurgence of replacement theology," its term for supersessionism, i.e., traditional Catholic teaching that the Jews have been superseded, and that the Church is the New Israel.[42] *Gift*, however, studiously ignored that repudiation, thus suggesting that the Vatican has aligned itself with the editorial policies of the *Jerusalem Post*, and that the Jews who have used Catholic-Jewish dialogue as a stalking horse to advance their agenda have succeeded in co-opting the "resurgence of replacement theology" that they feared as little as six years before.

Daniel Jonah Goldhagen expressed the view that dominates the Jewish imagination in *A Moral Reckoning: the Role of the Catholic Church in the Holocaust and its Unfulfilled Duty of Repair*, "For centuries the Catholic Church . . . harbored anti-Semitism at its core, as an integral part of its doctrine, its theology and its liturgy."[43]

A BISHOP'S CROZIER

Lumen Gentium's chapter on bishops describes at great length the duty the faithful have to obey their bishop, but little about the duties of the bishop to the faithful, a group which is referred to as the flock because the bishop is their shepherd. In its Decree on the Pastoral Office of Bishops in the Church, the Second Vatican Council described the bishop as "a good shepherd who knows his sheep and whose sheep know him, as a true father who excels in his love and solicitude for all, to whose divinely conferred authority all readily submit. He should so unite and mold his flock into one family that all, conscious of their duties, may live and act in the communion of charity."[44]

The bishop carries a crozier because his main job is to protect his sheep from wolves. Who are the wolves? Who is seeking to destroy the Church in our day? What group of people sought to destroy it in the time of Paul? In his epistle to the Romans, Paul refers to the Jews as "enemies of God" but, in spite

of their rebellion, "still loved by God, loved for the sake of their ancestors," because "God never takes back his gifts or revokes his choice" (Romans 11:28). We express that love by admonishing them for their sins, as Peter did, and urging them to accept baptism, which is necessary for salvation. If we do not do that we are collaborating in their damnation and the Jews Paul referred to remain, "the people who put the Lord Jesus to death" (I Thess 2). Those people persecuted Paul, and, to adopt his own words, "And now they have been persecuting us, and acting in a way that cannot please God and makes them the enemies of the whole human race" (I Thess 2:15-16). Is it the bishop's job to protect us from people like this or not?

The fact that the release of *Hunters*, the statement of Bishop Rhoades, and the declaration of bankruptcy of the diocese of Harrisburg took place within a period of 48 hours indicates a synchronous concatenation of events that could have been orchestrated by no human hand but which occurred for our instruction nonetheless.

The fact that Bishop Rhoades issued a statement is providential. He must now respond to the unanswered questions which his statement raised but did not resolve. Was this document aimed at me? Yes or no? If it was not aimed at me, then Bishop Rhoades should rebuke Dexter Van Zile for saying that it was. He should also rebuke all of the other Jewish Catholics who attacked me at Van Zile's behest for committing a sin against charity by blackening my name. A Catholic has a right to a good name.

WHY DO YOU STRIKE ME?

If his statement was written with me in mind, then Bishop Rhoades has to explain how what I have done rises to the level of moral fault, for, as the Second Vatican Council points out, the faithful must listen to the bishop as if to Christ when speaking on matters of faith and morals, but not when it comes to manners and the wisdom of this world. If what I did rises to the level of faith or morals, the bishop should point out my error. If I committed a sin, the bishop has a duty to point out what it was. If what I said does not rise to the level of moral fault, then the bishop has no business admonishing me. The bishop has no right to impose Jewish categories of thought on my conscience or that of anyone else in the Church. If he persists in doing so, he is like the Pharisees whom Jesus condemned because "the doctrines they teach are only human regulations" (Matt 15:9). Rejecting the adoption of Jewish categories of thought is not a sin; it is a duty. By participating in the "violins of hope" liturgy, the bishop sided with the Jews in their propaganda campaign to retain control over discourse against a member of his flock who was trying to defend the faithful against that campaign. In doing so, the bishop has not only internalized the commands of his oppressors, he has appointed himself to impose "human regulations" on fellow Catholics in the name of Catholic

teaching. In doing this he has imposed on the faithful unreasonable burdens which they have no duty to bear.

The Fathers of the Church would have rebuked him for his effrontery in imposing them, but God is the author of human history, and he has allowed this evil to happen for a reason. The reason is a refined consciousness of what the Church teaches and how that differs from the categories which the powers of this world want to impose on the minds of the faithful to lead them astray. Divine Providence has decreed that error cannot perdure in the Church Christ founded. *Hunters* is an example of the cunning of reason and a sign that God is ready to use the evil which Dexter Van Zile did to me as a way of bringing clarity to a confusion that has gone on for too long. It's a sign that it's time to call off the failed experiment known as Catholic-Jewish dialogue and return to the clarity of traditional, anti-Jewish Catholic teaching. That is my sincere understanding of the evil that has befallen not just me but the entire Catholic Church, and so let me conclude with the words Jesus addressed to the Jewish leaders of his day: If what I said is false, point out the error; if what I said is true, why do you strike me? (John 18:23).